

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XV.

OCTOBER, 1911.

No. 4.

WALTHER THE LUTHERAN.

(Continued.)

When one surveys the work of Walther's first year as editor, one is constrained to say that the promises made before *Der Lutheraner* made its appearance were faithfully kept. Koesterling¹⁾ relates that before publishing his church-paper Walther had submitted the following prospectus to a few pastors with whom he was acquainted:—

The aim of this paper shall be, 1. to acquaint men with the doctrine, treasures, and history of the Lutheran Church; 2. to prove that the Lutheran Church is not a sect, but the true Church of Christ; 3. to arouse love for the Lutheran Church; 4. to warn against, uncover, and refute false doctrine, to reveal those who falsely employ the Lutheran name for the purpose of spreading unbelief, misbelief, and enthusiastic notions, to repel attacks upon Lutheran doctrine, and to remove existing prejudices against our Church; 5. to unite the isolated members of our Church, to bring back into our Church those who have fallen away from it, and to prove that our Church is not extinct, yea, that it never can become extinct; 6. to put into the hands of Lutheran ministers a means for making plain to their congregations certain issues which can be thoroughly explained and urgently presented to them in no other way; 7. to counteract separatistic tendencies, to comfort and strengthen those who are in doubt and saddened because of the ruin of the Church, and to show them that there is nothing to compel them to fly into the arms of the sects which seem to prosper so greatly; 8. to rebuke dead orthodoxism, every sinful and ruinous movement with which we are being threatened, especially avarice, worldliness, misapplication of liberty, etc.; 9. to offer information regarding the present condition of the Lutheran

1) *Auswanderung der sächsischen Lutheraner*, etc., p. 113 f.

Church. The guiding principle of this paper shall be, as follows: Every article must be submitted to a test by means of the Holy Scriptures as they are explained in the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and even such novel views as are not in direct contradiction to the Scriptures and the Confessions shall not be evolved in our paper, because they might easily excite strife and beget error among Lutherans. The character of this paper shall be as follows: 1. As far as possible every article shall be written in popular style, and the paper is not to contain learned stuff ("gelehrten Kram"); 2. it is to be edifying, not indulging in strife of words and offensive personalities; 3. it is to be of general interest to every lover of the Lutheran truth; 4. it is to be frank and firm, not inclined to make false concessions, nor sacrificing the least particle of truth for the sake of charity and peace; 5. it is not to meddle with political affairs, or such as do not concern the interest of the Lutheran Church; possible advertisements from which Lutherans might derive a benefit shall be excepted; 6. it is to breathe the spirit of love and tolerance; it is to pity and instruct rather than to thunder and fulminate; it is to bear in mind that the invisible Church is everywhere; 7. when errorists are attacked, every charge must rest upon an unquestioned basis of fact and truth; opponents must never be given cause to say justly, We do not teach the doctrine for which you attack us.

From the financial point of view this program did not promise great results. As a business venture one would have to pronounce it a reckless undertaking. Walther at no time in his life was a rich man. His journalistic enterprise was badly secured in a commercial way. It was mainly backed by his spirit of boundless self-sacrifice and by the promise of aid from his congregation. That promise could not amount to very much in any great emergency; for, although the Saxon immigrants had been a fairly well-to-do society when they landed at St. Louis, their goods had been wasted by shocking mismanagement. The early days in the colony were days of penury and want. When one bears in mind these unfavorable premises, the act of publishing *Der Lutheraner* looms up as an act of spiritual heroism, and its success is another proof and illustration of the mighty power innate in the truth of God's Word, — a power which prevails over and against the most forbidding odds.

Opinions on Walther's paper were divided, and after the first year's work these opinions had crystallized into the form which they retain to this day. There were men who were heartily disgusted with the constant appeals of *Der Lutheraner* to the Lutheran Confessions, with its relentless criticism of un-Lutheran practices of individual pastors and congregations and entire church bodies, and with its continued exhibition of the superiority of former conditions in the Lutheran Church over those prevailing at the present time. To these people Walther's distinct Lutheran emphasis boded nothing but evil. It sounded to them like the speech of a bigot, to hear of the heritage of pure teaching that had been entrusted to the Lutheran Church, of the evil of false teaching, of the conscientious duty of every sincere believer in the truth of Scripture to resist error by word and act. They had for generations been accustomed to a *manus manum lavat* policy as regards their interdenominational relations. Insistence on any particular form of teaching as the only Scriptural one, to the exclusion of any other as false, seemed to augur conceit and arrogance to them, and some did not hesitate to say that these "Altlutheraner" were Crypto-Romanists, and their system of teaching and church-government contained a papistic leaven. The Stephan episode was being cited as evidence to show what fruits would be matured under this system.

Much of this criticism, indeed, emanated from sheer ignorance of the teachings and principles of Lutheranism. The Lutheran Confessions had not been studied. There were Lutheran ministers who had not even seen a copy of the Book of Concord, much less had read and pondered its contents. Add to this that Walther had but recently arrived in this country, whose citizens have ever prided themselves on their freedom and independence in thought and action, and that, hence, Walther's doctrinal determination was regarded as a German trait, and it is not surprising to hear his earnest effort in behalf of genuine Lutheranism denounced as "foreign," "un-American."

But there were others—and their number was rapidly increasing with every issue of *Der Lutheraner*—who were just

as outspoken in their praises of Walther's journal. Many of them had not been heard of before in any prominent connection in the affairs of the American Lutheran Church. They seem to have been quiet persons who were doing the Church's work in a quiet way, saddened perhaps by the gloomy prospects ahead for Lutheranism as they viewed them, submitting resignedly to conditions which they felt themselves unable to alter, or hoping against hope for a better day. These were now seen coming out of their retirement. It is said Wyneken actually leaped for joy when he received his first copy of *Der Lutheraner* and exclaimed, "God be praised, there are still Lutherans in America!" (Wyneken was making a hopeless fight for Lutheran teaching in the General Synod. At one time he presented a resolution to that effect; it was listened to with great amusement, and in the printed report of the meeting at which this occurred his resolution was called "funny.") Walther received encouraging communications from all parts of the country. It became customary to report deviations from Lutheran teaching and practice by Lutherans in his paper, and men who were dissatisfied with un-Lutheran conditions in their own body published their complaints in *Der Lutheraner*. Congregations whose faithful pastors were being maligned appealed to Walther for protection, and he published their statements in his paper. *Der Lutheraner* became the rallying center for the quickened Lutheran conscience in America and the unofficial organ of little bands of men scattered through Missouri, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, New York, and Maryland. The early volumes of *Der Lutheraner* are intensely interesting literature, whether they are studied from the view-point of the Lutheran church-historian or the Lutheran confessionalist. Walther's paper was proving a mighty precipitant: wherever it was thrown into muddied Lutheran waters, impurities began to settle, and the waters were being clarified.

It is worth while to hear Walther relate his experience as an editor. In his "Foreword" to the second volume of *Der Lutheraner*, on September 6, 1845, he writes as follows:—

When we assumed the publication of this journal a year ago, we did not by any means do so from a consciousness of our qualification for such an enterprise. We rather felt as one feels when a conflagration starts somewhere: if there are no strong men on the spot, even the weakest feels himself called upon to hurry and render such aid as he can. Thus the stress in which we found our dear Evangelical Lutheran Church also in this country emboldened us to come out publicly with our feeble testimony in her behalf. In so doing, we relied upon the gracious assistance of Him who regards those of low estate; and we were not only fully assured of the energetic cooperation which a few brethren in the faith had promised us, but we were also hoping quietly that it would not be a long time that we would have to conduct, with our unskilled arm, this battle in behalf of the most momentous and sacred affair, the pure, divine truth, and that soon some one better qualified and trained for this work would feel himself urged to take our place and to show that what we had so feebly defended is nevertheless, and will remain, the unconquerable truth.

As regards the first two reasons for our confidence at the beginning of our little enterprise, our hope has not been deceived. God has graciously assisted us, and we have not been put to shame with our feeble testimony. For this His holy name be praised and blessed for evermore! Our esteemed coworkers, too, have fulfilled their promises, and the prompt issuance of our paper is primarily due to their contributions. Nor must we fail to mention to the glory of God that the members of our local Evangelical Lutheran congregation have gladly made sacrifices, thus enabling us, in spite of the small number of subscribers at the beginning, to continue our paper as a means for professing our common faith. But while we should gladly have turned our *Lutheraner* over to an abler editor, and while we should certainly expect an increase of subscribers and greater efficiency for our paper under a new editor, still our endeavors to obtain one have proved fruitless. On the contrary, esteemed friends have encouraged us to continue our paper under our editorial signature. Accordingly, as long as the Lord is pleased to grant us His grace, we shall not refuse to conduct the management of this little enterprise. We commend it to His care, for whose glory it was undertaken.

Before closing this foreword, we deem it necessary to explain the aim and character of *Der Lutheraner*, that is, its real purpose and the principles by which we are guided in editing it. It appears that not a few persons have been offended because *Der Lutheraner* contains not many contributions of a purely devotional character, and publishes chiefly polemical articles. For this reason some have not

hesitated to charge us publicly with quarrelsomeness and to actually oppose us as an enemy of practical Christianity. Accordingly, we make the following statement once for all time.

While we do not assume to pass judgment on the editors of Christian journals who pursue as their chief aim that of devotion, and while we cordially rejoice at every good result attained by such efforts, still for our part we are convinced that we ought not to habituate Christians to devote that time which should be given to the daily edification of their souls chiefly to the reading of a newspaper, often quite a voluminous one. Even when we leave out of the account the unedifying character of many contributions purporting to be edifying, we hold nevertheless that, upon the whole, the multitude of purely devotional articles, mostly small as to size, which are published by many religious journals, cannot but dissipate the mind of the reader and create in him a certain spiritual fastidiousness; it is not possible that these articles could serve the purpose of giving to any soul a connected account of the entire counsel of God for our salvation, and thus to advance a person in knowledge step by step. Must not Christian journalists rather consider it their duty to guide their readers chiefly to a daily and diligent use of the Bible, and thus to draw the water of life from the fountain-head?—Moreover, the Christian Church possesses such an abundant supply of old books of devotion, full of substance, thorough, complete, spiritedly written, and revealing a high degree of experience, that one is inclined in our day, when such fathers in Christ as the authors of those books were are vainly sought, to remind every one of what is said in Eccl. 12, 12: "My son, be admonished: of making of books there is no end." As regards the promotion of devotional interests by means of books, we for our part believe that the best we could do would be to republish and urgently recommend to all Christians such excellent works, before others, as those of Luther, Brentius, Jerome Weller, Martin Chemnitz, Johann Gerhard, J. Arnd, Heinrich Mueller, Scriver, and others.²⁾ It is our humble

2) It is to be regretted that Luther's writings are least in the hands of the common people, because after their first publication they have usually been published in entire editions and not in selections. Accordingly, the entire works of Luther were bought only by professional men, and, as a rule, are now decaying in their libraries. Of America it is needless to speak in this connection. It is manifest that in America there prevails an ignorance, even among Lutherans, of the writings of Luther that cannot be sufficiently bewailed. For in America it is not a startling occurrence at all when even "Lutheran" writers, in their ignorance of what Luther has written, proclaim him now a rationalist, now a sacramentarian, now a half-fledged semi-papist. Unless, therefore, the writings

opinion that, while we have these precious guides to genuine, vital Christianity, there is no need of our publishing books for general devotion, yea, that we ought to put forth strenuous endeavors that the sterling books afore-named, and others like them, may not be forgotten, or supplanted by modern books composed in a spirit of self-elected piety and not emanating from a profound spiritual experience.

As regards *doctrine*, the case is different. New defenses for doctrine must be provided because new attacks are ever and again made upon it, new adulterations of it are being attempted, or ancient heresies are dressed out in a new garb and paraded. Accordingly, in future issues of *Der Lutheraner* we shall continue to keep this as our chief aim before our eyes, *viz.*, to promote the knowledge of the true *doctrine*, and to serve our readers in these days so full of pitfalls as a guide that is constantly at their side, warning them against unbelief and misbelief, such as numerous false prophets in our day are proclaiming in speech and writing. All the uncharitable judgments to which we have had to submit in the past, and may have to submit in the future, shall not swerve us from our purpose. By the grace of God we know, on the one hand, what a precious treasure pure, unadulterated teaching is, and that nothing but such teaching can be the true foundation for genuine unfeigned godliness; on the other hand, we are conscious of having written nothing from quarrelsomeness or vainglory, nor in a vindictive spirit, but from pure love of the truth which God has kindled in us, and for the salvation of our erring brethren. Finally, we are comforted by the reflection that we are not alone, but in our battling we have for our guides and patterns all the holy prophets and apostles, yea, Christ, the most holy

of Luther are again placed into the hands of the common people, there is reason to fear that ultimately the poor people in our country will in good faith accept as Lutheran anything that is being offered them under that name, even if it is something which Luther in his day with holy zeal has combated as a fatal error. Accordingly, we cannot pass by this opportunity to call the attention of our readers, and especially of our brethren in the ministry, to the call for subscriptions, herewith renewed, for a reprint of Luther's House Postil. This call appeals to all who are concerned about the dissemination of Lutheran teaching, and reminds them what a treasure they would bring into their congregations if they were to induce their members to purchase this valuable book. — Two years ago both the Church Postil and the House Postil were to have been published at Buffalo, but the noble enterprise, we regret to state, was wrecked upon the rock of Lutheran indifference, both among laymen and ministers. God grant that this new endeavor at New York may not prove abortive, for our humiliation.

Son of God Himself; for these, while they were actuated by the greatest love, have nevertheless manifested a most solemn zeal in opposing errorists and every deviation from the revealed truths, and have unto their death fought against them in their sermons and writings. We shall gladly continue to follow them, not heeding the unfavorable judgments which are being passed on our endeavor by the world and such as are its kith, and striving only for this that we may be found a faithful steward.

We repeat, however, that we shall never fail to remember that it behooves us more than others to appear before the public in unfeigned humility and modesty, because we were formerly walking errors' ways ourselves. But our personal experience of the pernicious influence which even such an error as had been joined with self-elected humility and self-denial can exert on our whole life in time and eternity, obligates us all the more to testify against error wherever we may find it, and wherever there is the least prospect that our testimony may produce a good result.

We shall consider our humble labor abundantly rewarded if God continues to bless *Der Lutheraner*, to the end that by its contents here or there some one may have the conviction quickened in him that purity of teaching is an important matter, or that some one may be strengthened in this conviction.

A year later, on September 5, 1846, Walther writes in the same place as follows:—

With the present number we begin the third volume of our journal. We confess that we do this with a joy such as we did not experience at the beginning of the two previous volumes. Not as though our reliance upon our own efficiency had waxed stronger; the cause of our joy is rather this, that we are plainly beholding how the Lord Himself is prospering the cause which this little paper of ours would like to serve in its humble way.

For there is no doubt that God has arisen to remove the rubbish under which our dear Evangelical Lutheran Church in America lay buried a long time. What was the state of affairs in our country a few years ago, and what is it now? There were but a few calling themselves Lutheran, who knew the true Lutheran doctrine, and still less there were who professed and defended it. The Book of Concord, which contains the public confessions of our Church, was not even known by name, much less by its contents, among most of the Lutherans in our country. Very few persons possessed any of the writings of Luther. The majority of the ministers still calling themselves Lutheran had adopted the Zwinglian-Reformed errors (for example, regarding the Lord's Supper, Baptism, Absolution, Original Sin, etc.), and many of these had also adopted the practice of the

Methodists, the so-called "new measures." Accordingly, the majority of our congregations were not united in the one Lutheran faith, but they were mixed societies, composed of Lutherans and Reformed. In these congregations Books of Forms (Agenden) and hymn-books had been introduced that were made to suit an unbeliever or a follower of a false faith as much as a believer. Briefly, while the Lutheran Church in America had not lapsed into such crass infidelity and such plain paganism as it had nearly everywhere in Germany, still it had fallen away from the faith, had faithlessly deserted the banner of the Confessions under which the fathers had fought, had cast away the precious legacy of the pure doctrine confided to her, had contaminated itself by spiritual adultery, by fellowship with all the sects, and had not retained anything Lutheran but—the name. In spite of this awful state of affairs most Lutherans in America cherished the belief that all was quite well with them. For, they said, our ministers are not rationalists; we are conducting many prayer-meetings; occasionally we effect conversions, and so on. Like the Laodiceans of old, the Lutherans in America were in the habit of saying: "I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing," Rev. 3, 14—19. And although the most varying shades of teaching and belief prevailed among those who called themselves Lutheran, still they were living in mutual peace as profound as among the dead in a graveyard. (1 Thess. 5, 3; comp. Ezek. 13.) Nobody interfered with another; a person might hold whatever views he pleased, he was accounted a brother beloved, provided he sang the common song of all.

In a general view, such was the condition of the Lutheran Church in our country a few years ago. If any one thinks this sketch overdrawn, let him read the epistle recently sent to Germany by the so-called General Synod of the American Lutheran Church in the name of 320 Lutheran ministers and 726 Lutheran congregations, and he will there find the defection which we have portrayed shamelessly professed and heralded as a progressive achievement.³⁾

3) In connection with the above the acknowledgment which the *Lutheran Standard* has made may be compared. See *Lutheraner*, vol. 2, No. 14. (This is the statement of Editor Spielmann to which we referred in the April issue at the end of the first article.) Also the treatise by B. Kurz, "Why are you a Lutheran?" the "Portraiture of Lutheranism" by S. Schmucker, and lastly, the "Lutherische Hirtenstimme." (This was a rationalistic publication of Rev. Weyl, of Baltimore.) This paper has, under its Lutheran signature, incessantly expectorated its venomous froth against the true Lutheran doctrine, and yet is regarded as the organ of a considerable part of the Lutheran Church,—thus evidencing the awful defection of the American Lutheran Church.

Over and against this, what has come to pass? Since a few years ago voices have been raised, now here, now there, in defense of the truth that had been surrendered, and in opposition to the error that had been espoused. To begin with, Prof. Schmidt, in his *Kirchenzeitung*, raised his voice to denounce the defection which had taken place, and called attention to the Confessions of our Church and to the most important of the polemical writings of Luther against the Reformed, from which he published excerpts. He was soon followed by others who made use of the *Kirchenzeitung* to witness against the pernicious evils which had arisen, and to summon men to purge our Church from her errors. These were joined two years ago by *Der Lutheraner*, which paper likewise made it its task to reveal departures in teaching and practice which had occurred, and to point out the necessity of a sincere return to the principles of the Reformation. Pastor Wyneken was moved by the misery of the German Lutherans in America to go to Germany and present the condition of our Church to brethren of the faith orally and in writing, appealing to them for aid. Lo and behold! all these efforts have not been in vain. The former lethargy is a thing of the past; a healthy movement has arisen. Many upright persons who for a long time had secretly mourned the ruin of the Church which they had recognized, but had despaired of a general improvement of existing conditions, now conceived courage and came forward. Others, who had heretofore regarded the prevailing state of affairs as a desirable one, have had their eyes opened and are horrified, and now are gladly joining the ranks of those who desire a reformation. Others have been convicted by the testimony of the truth, and now begin to feel ashamed of the position which they have occupied. True, they still are viewing the witnesses that have arisen with suspicion; however, they are quietly beginning to put away the error with which they have been charged. Others are still standing undecided at the parting of the ways, but they are at variance with themselves and roused out of their former security. A general interest in doctrinal matters, which had become nearly extinct, has been aroused again. Luther's writings are being dug up from the dust in which they have lain moldering; they are being republished and put into the hands of the laity.⁴⁾ The confessional writings of our Church are emerging from the night which covered them into

4) Our readers are aware that Luther's *House Postil* has been published in an excellent edition this year by Mr. Ludwig in New York City. A hopeful sign, too, amongst others, is this, that the English Lutheran Tennessee Synod has had the important letter of Luther, "Of the Anabaptists," reprinted, and issues the same as an appendix to its latest annual report.

the light of day; people cease more and more being ashamed of them; they are read again, readers of church-papers are having their attention called to them, they are partly republished, and appeals are made to them.⁵⁾ It seems as if the carnal peace in which men have been slumbering so sweetly can no longer be maintained. A great war has broken out, which is becoming more general day by day. Everywhere divisions are taking place; at the same time there is manifested among the orthodox a determined desire for most intimate union. Evidently we are on the threshold of a most important and, we firmly trust to God, most salutary crisis for our Church.

True, the men who are now battling to restore the Lutheran Church to her original form, especially as regards doctrine, still are as a drop in the bucket compared with the men who are fighting against them. But no matter how few they are in number, no matter what sneers, derision, and persecution their society may have to suffer, no matter what efforts are being made to render them suspected to the people and to represent them, against better knowledge and conviction, as a new sect that is secretly planning to lead the Lutherans back to Rome, no matter if men call them Old Lutherans, Puseyites, or even secret Jesuits,—we are not afraid. The Spirit of Lies may rave ever so much, the *Lord* has nevertheless arisen for the defense of His Church. Neither numbers, nor might, nor cunning, nor lies, nor calumnies, can check Him. He will accomplish His work with His almighty power. Truth will conquer, and the *enemies* of the truth will be confounded. Amen.

It is truly refreshing to observe the modesty of Walther in his willingness to share with others whatever credit there was due to men for the remarkable change that was gradually, but surely coming over the American Lutheran Church. His, after all, had been yeoman's service in the cause of restoring Lutheranism to its former glory. He continued the work when others laid down their weapons; yea, he increased his efficiency as a warrior for the truth with the advance of years and the increase of his followers. Greater results than those indicated in this article were to follow from his unflinching and ever-consistent testimony for the righteous cause of God's Word and Luther's doctrine pure.

(*To be continued.*)

5) This is done in the *Lutheran Standard*. This paper reports that the Ohio Synod will unite with the Tennessee Synod in an effort to publish the entire Book of Concord in English.

ROMANISM A PLAGIARISM ON PAGANISM.

Father Vaughan of London, at the Eucharistic celebration at Montreal, 1910, said it was "the genius of Protestantism to invent a would-be religion." (*Lit. Dig.*, Sept. 24, 1910.) Cardinal Logue of Ireland said at St. Patrick's Cathedral, in New York City, on October 11, 1910, "I never could see how any intelligent Christian could oppose Catholicism." (*N. Y. Tribune*, Oct. 24, 1910.) Archbishop Ryan said at the dedication of St. Patrick's that the "Catholic faith is superior to all creeds." (*Lit. Dig.*, Oct. 22, 1910.) Mr. Quinn O'Brien of Chicago said to the Knights of Columbus at the Milwaukee Auditorium, on October 12, 1910, "that not sufficient interest is shown by Catholics in the Bible. Protestantism corrected abuses in the Catholic Church of the Middle Ages. It has done much for the intellects of men of the present day." He called upon the knights to throw wide the church portals to let the Protestants come in, since "Protestantism has run its course and served its purpose." (*Milw. Free Press*, Oct. 13, 1910.)

Mr. Quinn O'Brien is quite sincere, no doubt, and we thank him heartily for his kind invitation. We must decline the same, however, for not quite all abuses in the Catholic Church have been corrected, as we purpose to show in the following pages. While we do that, we shall also, at the same time, indirectly pay our respects to the three other speakers quoted in the beginning.

The heathen called the early Christians atheists. Why? Because they had no temples, altars, priests, sacrifices, nor anything of that ceremonial and ritual in which the vulgar commonly see the essence of religion. But in course of time all the pagan pomp was introduced by the Romanists.

For three hundred years the heathen could always say to the Christian, "You have no right to exist"—*Non licet esse vos*. (Tertullian, *Apol.*, c. 4.) The sword of Damocles hung over every Christian's neck, and sometimes it came down in terrible persecutions, commonly counted ten.

It was not natural for hypocrites to join the Christians

during these centuries, and so the Church remained fairly pure in doctrine and holy in life. But when the Emperor Constantine, in 312, declared for Christianity and repressed paganism, Christianity became fashionable and profitable, and so it was natural for many pagans to come into the Church and to retain their paganism in belief and in life.

The Roman Catholic Lord Acton and many others have spoken in language of the strongest reprehension of the superstition of the early Church. It begins about the middle of the third century: we see it first distinctly in Cyprian, Novatian, and Gregory Thaumaturgus; and in the fourth century it is strongly marked. Gregory Thaumaturgus, the pupil of Origen, and many others, sanctioned practices of which they did not approve, in order to make it easier for the heathen to come over to Christianity, and the ignorant converts sensibly lowered the tone of the whole body. Paulinus of Nola followed the same policy in the fourth century in Campania. "The church-ale was so like the heathen festival that it was really the same thing." (Bigg, pp. 83. 84.)

About the year 400, Vigilantius of Gaul, a very early pioneer of Luther, vigorously attacked superstitious practices, notably relic worship and the vigils in the basilicas of the martyrs.

Augustine, about the same time, also grieves bitterly over the popular superstition which led the crowds to kneel in adoration before the tombs of the saints, and writes against "imitating the pagans here, who adore the dead."

So corrupt had the "Christians" of the Roman empire become that Salvian of Marseilles, about 450, thought the barbarian Goths more worthy to be the masters of the world. "Their modesty purifies the earth all stained by Roman debauchery."

Ammianus Marcellinus, Jerome, and Chrysostom also write against the Roman rottenness. Fervid Roman Catholic though he is, the scholarly Montalambert, in his *Monks of the West*, strongly endorses the conclusions of Salvian when he describes

the Roman empire without the barbarians as "an abyss of servitude and corruption." (Spence, pp. 491. 506.)

In Italy they observed the custom of setting out food for the dead four days before the feast of the Chair of St. Peter on February 18, the date of the ancient Feralia. (Burekhardt 2, 283.)

From the letters and poems of Paulinus of Nola we see that to the Campanian peasant the local saint was often merely the local god with a thin Christian veneer.

Eusebius observed the "unspeakable hypocrisy" of those who had crept into the church. In 493, Pope Gelasius forbade Christians celebrating the Lupercalia, one of the most licentious heathen festivals. In 625, the Council of Rheims punished Christians for taking part in heathen observances.

The 5th canon of the Council of Clovesho condemned various "paganiae," such as "auguries, divinations, incantations, and profane sacrifices, which were performed in adjoining churches . . . under the name of holy martyrs and confessors." Also the Council of Lestines (743).

Faustus rebukes the Catholics for carrying on the heathen ceremonies. "Their sacrifices indeed you have turned into Christian feasts; their idols into martyrs, whom, with like vows you worship; you appease the shades of the dead with wine and meals; you celebrate the Gentiles' solemn days with them;—of their life, certainly you have changed naught."

In 531, the Emperor Justinian issued an edict commanding all pagans to receive baptism, on pain of exile and confiscation of all their property, within three months; and this was no dead letter.

In Mesopotamia the conversion of the governor of a city was followed at once by the conversion of all the inhabitants. In Asia Minor Bishop John baptized 70,000 converts. To save his life, Cyrus of Constantinople not only declared himself a Christian, but was ordained priest; Theodosius II made him bishop in Phrygia. He reached there at Christmas. Asked to preach, he said such a mystery is best celebrated in silence!

After the victory of Tolbiac, Clovis was baptized on Christmas Day, 496, and 3000 of his warriors with him. When Vladimir of Russia was baptized, the whole people of Kief plunged into the river, and the priests read the baptismal prayers from the bank. Augustine baptized 10,000 Angles on one Christmas Day. Bede tells us Retwald, King of East Anglia, had under one roof a Christian altar and a heathen altar. In Ireland chiefs were converted, and their whole tribes quietly accepted the new religion.

Gregory the Great starved peasants into Christianity; slaves were chastised into it; freemen were imprisoned; Jews were bribed into it by a 25 or 33 per cent. discount on their rent; in Istria he used soldiers to convert the people; he exhorted Ethelbert and Brunichildis to compel their heathen subjects to become Christians.

Pope Gregory instructed Augustine: "Whereas it is a custom among the Saxons to slay abundance of oxen and sacrifice them to the devil, you must not abolish that custom, but appoint a new festival to be kept either on the day of the consecration of the churches, or the birthday of the saints whose relics are deposited there, and on those days the Saxons may be allowed to make arbors round the temples changed into churches, to kill their oxen and to feast, as they did while they were pagans; only they shall offer their thanks and praises, not to the devil, but to God."

Aringhus, a Romish writer, says: "The Popes found it necessary, in the conversion of the gentiles, to dissemble and wink at many things and yield to the times, and not to use force against customs which the people are so obstinately fond of, nor to think of extirpating at once everything that had the appearance of profane."

Under Charles the Great multitudes of Saxons were baptized by force, falsely declaring, says the chronicler, that they desired to become Christians. For eating meat during Lent, death was inflicted. Norway was forcefully converted by Olaf Tryggvason and Olaf the Saint.

Lecky says: "Vast tribes of savages who had always been idolaters . . . and who for the most part had been converted, not by individual persuasion, but by the commands of their chiefs, embraced Christianity in such multitudes that their habits of mind soon became the dominating habits of the Church." Romanism gained the world and lost her soul.

In the XXIX. chapter of his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," Gibbon shows how paganism crept into the Church. In his notes he shows that Faustus the Manichean accuses the Catholics of idolatry, that M. de Beausobre admits the introduction of Christian idolatry in the fourth and fifth centuries, and that "the Imitation of Paganism" is the subject of Dr. Middleton's letter from Rome.

Bramante built at San Pietro in Montorio, over the blood of the martyr, a chapel in the light and cheerful form of a peripteros. (Ranke, *Popes*, p. 27.)

"On that cross I will throw up into the sky the Pantheon," said Michael Angelo. The pagan Pantheon on the Christian cross, that is St. Peter's Cathedral in Rome; the combination is a good illustration of the religion of Rome.

At the great central door of St. Peter's are the bronze gates of Filarete ordered by Pope Eugenius IV in envy of Ghiberti's at Florence, which are like prose to poetry. Side by side with our Lord, etc., are Venus in the arms of Mars, Europa raped by the Bull, Leda caressing the Swan, Jupiter and Ganymede! Another good illustration of the religion of Rome.

"This is paganized Christianity," said a Roman prelate about the Cathedral of Orvieto, where heathen gods and Christian saints are represented side by side.

Gregorovius writes: "Pallavicini has bitterly upbraided Leo X because he preferred the fables of paganism to the doctrines of Christianity. . . . In Leo's age paganism seemed entirely to discard the vesture of Christianity, in which as imagination, sense of form, and polytheism, it had always survived among the Latins. Could a Roman of Cicero's time

have been present in the sixteenth century at the festival of one of the saints of the Church on whom the epithet of *Divus* had been bestowed, he would scarcely have discovered anything unfamiliar in his surroundings. In Roman sepulchral inscriptions God is again Jupiter.—Dante had already called him *Sommo Giove*,—and heaven again Olympus. The Conservators of Rome, who restored a cistern on the Capitol, inscribed on it like ancient Romans: ‘We have founded the vessel; do thou fill it, O Jupiter, with rain, and be gracious to the presidents of thy rock.’ The cardinals were called senators, the saints simply gods (*Dii* and *Deae*), and the deifying title of *Divus*, as that of *Optimus Maximus*, is usually bestowed on the popes. When Leo ascended the throne, the poet Janus Vitalis announced that Jupiter had again descended from Olympus to Rome, and that Leo Medici as Apollo would cure all the maladies of the time. Neither had Julius II been dismayed when one Good Friday a preacher had likened him to Zeus, and compared Christ to Decius or Curtius. . . . Paganism oozed through every pore of Catholicism. . . . Among the Latins the Christian religion had become petrified into a pagan service of the senses and of formulas. . . . The beloved pagans were transplanted into the glory of the heaven of the blessed, where they exchanged greetings with the Christian successors to their splendor. . . . Skepticism reigned universally. . . . Priests laughed among themselves, as in former days the augurs in ancient Rome, and allowed their hands to be reverently kissed by smiling laymen. . . . The papal censorship of the sixteenth century, after Leo X. persecuted not the abominable works of Aretino, but the writings of the serious-minded Flaminio, and Sadoletto’s treatise on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans was placed on the Index. . . . The most horrible of all authors, Pietro Aretino, even entertained hopes of the cardinal’s purple. . . . The state, wealth, luxury, and culture, all had been usurped by the priests. The annual revenues of many cardinals amounted to 30,000 ducats and upwards. . . . In the time of Clement VII the young cardinal Ippolito Medici

supported 300 poetasters in his palace. . . . In truth, the Rome of Julius II and Leo X resembled on a reduced scale the Rome of the Roman emperors. . . . "God be praised," wrote Cardinal Bibiena, "for we want nothing here but a court of women." In the time of Innocent VIII and Alexander VI illustrious women were boldly invited to the banquets at the Vatican. . . . No good woman could have moved voluntarily and at ease among the monsignori. . . . In Roman society the place of noble women was filled by mistresses and courtesans. Before he became cardinal, Bembo lived openly with the beautiful Venetian Morosina. Leo X showed no hesitation in attending the marriage of Agostino Chigi with his mistress Francesca. . . . Becadelli's theory, that courtesans occupy a more useful place than pious nuns was acted on in Rome. As the surname Romana had been given to the last saintly Roman woman in the time of Eugenius IV, so with equal national pride people now talked of a Cortisana Romana. We should inspire disgust, did we attempt to depict the unbounded vice of Roman society in the corrupt times of Leo X, or to lift the veil from the mysteries of the priesthood. The moral corruption of the age, one of the best of whose productions bore the title of 'Syphilis,' is sufficiently known. . . . Even before Luther or Hutten, Savonarola had described Rome as a sink of iniquity. . . . As a satirist it seemed even to Erasmus a great European carnival, where worldly vanity went masked in spiritual attire, where were represented all lusts and desires, all intrigues and crimes, their magnet the Vatican, and thirst for gold, honors, and power the forces that moved them. Sailing on this tumultuous sea, he seemed to behold Sebastian Brant's overcrowded 'Ship of Fools;' and, in fact, soon after his arrival in London, in 1509, he wrote his celebrated 'Praise of Folly' in the house of Thomas More. As a Christian he was astonished at the bold and glaring coloring borrowed from Paganism by the Roman religion, of which nothing remained that was not false, and whose formerly revered temple had been transformed by the ambition and rapacity of the priesthood into a European

banking house and a retail market for diplomas of favors, indulgences, and objects of superstition." (*Rome in Middle Ages*, vol. VIII, pt. 1, pp. 295—311.)

The learned Fra Colonna in Charles Reade's "The Cloister and the Hearth" eloquently astonishes the simple Dutch monk by pointing out the identity of many papal Roman customs with pagan Roman customs.

When the bigoted Romanist Linacre, under Henry VIII, fell in with a copy of the New Testament, he said, with an oath, "Either this book is not true, or we are not Christians."

When the Jesuits went to India, they stained their bodies, and swore that they were Brahmins, who could trace their pedigree to the god Brahma. In China the Jesuits taught that the doctrines of Confucius differed little or nothing from their own. (Wylie, p. 527.)

Dr. Sven Hedin, the famous Swedish explorer of Tibet, is the subject of angry attacks by Roman Catholic papers. In his book he says that many customs and ceremonies of the Buddhists in Tibet are very similar to those practiced by and in the Roman Catholic Church. He mentions the rosaries, the monks, and the nuns, the worship and the pope-like Dalai Lama.

"A Modernist's Letter to Pius X" asks: "Where is there aught of the religion of Jesus? How discover beneath this pagan superstition and Pharisaic formalism a single element . . . of spiritual worship? How does it differ from the revolving barrel of the Buddhist, or the mummerly of a medicine-man?" (p. 96. 138.) The writer was formerly a Paulist Father and professor at the Catholic Georgetown University at Washington, D. C.

PONTIFEX MAXIMUS.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus says the Pontifex Maximus "has a sovereign control in all the most weighty affairs, judging all cases relating to sacred things, as also those between private individuals. He enacts new laws on his own authority in causes for which those in being do not provide."

As a rule, the Pontifex was also Emperor. In processions

he was carried in a gilded ivory carrying-chair, surrounded by the Sacred College and Senate. In front is borne the sword of state, emblem of imperialism. He is garbed in white, "of all hues most pleasing to the gods" (Cicero), richly decked with golden plates and many jewels; around his head are waved, on long thin stems, ostrich and peacock feathers; doves and other birds are let loose.

The Emperor Gratian would not have the title and the homage as unfit for a Christian. The Pope took the heathen title and worship and introduced this heathenism into Romanism. When Luther was in Rome, he saw Julius II in such a procession.

The Roman emperor and Pontifex Maximus Caligula decreed that subjects coming into his presence should kiss his foot. This aroused keen indignation; the *optimi* declared it an insult to liberty and a piece of Persian slavery. (Seneca.)

This pagan custom was introduced by Pope Gregory VII, and the proudest papist is proud to kiss the Pope's toe.

The "Pastoral Staff" of the Romish bishop is simply the "Lituus" of Romulus and the augurs. It seems to be of Babylonish origin; one was carried by Assur Nasir Pal, 880 B. C.

At Lhassa the Buddhists have had an infallible Dalai Lama for many centuries, just as the papists have an infallible Pope at Rome—since 1870.

THE ROSARY.

In India many spend hours in simply repeating the name of a god. In order to keep count of the number of times such a prayer is repeated, a string of 108 seeds is used, a rosary. So many times the text must be repeated; if done oftener, it is a work of merit, of supererogation, a surplus that can be transferred to another.

Mohammedans use a rosary to count the "Ninety-nine Beautiful Names of Allah." St. Peter Damiani, who died in 1072, mentions as something strange that some clergymen repeated daily the prayer, "Hail, Mary, full of grace!" Bishop Odo of Paris, about 1200, recommends to the priests to hold

the people to recite the "Hail, Mary!" as well as the Lord's Prayer and the Creed. (Bain, 132.)

Though Christ says, "Use not vain repetitions as the heathen do," the Romanists have introduced this heathen superstition of "telling their beads" (Anglo-Saxon *bede*, prayer; a *bedesman* is one paid to pray for another). Pope Sixtus V. in 1587, granted an indulgence of fifty days to Christians as often as they salute others with the words, "Praised be Jesus Christ!" and as many to him who devoutly answers, "Amen." He also granted twenty-five days indulgence to those who simply repeat the name Jesus. Etc., etc. These promises were confirmed in 1728 by Benedict XIII.

In course of time the "Hail, Mary!" took the place of the Lord's Prayer to a great extent. At the times of the crusades Peter of Amiens brought the rosary from the East and introduced it in the West, 1094—1095.

Jacob Sprenger, the well-known Grand Inquisitor of Germany in 1475, founded the first Confraternity of the Rosary in the Dominican church in Cologne, in order to save the city from the troubles of war. Pope Sixtus IV granted it the privilege of hundred days' indulgence: three years after it was lengthened to seven years. Leo X. in 1520, granted still greater purgatorial privileges. The victory of Lepanto, of John of Austria, over the Turks, in 1571, was ascribed to the rosary, and the first Sunday in October was made the Festival of the Rosary, and this soon became universal. (Bain, *Devel.* 134.)

PURGATORY.

The Persians believed in a cleansing fire which would in time burn up all evil. In India the god of fire, Agni, is the purifier, and the Hindus are burned to ashes to be freed from all impurity. At the entrance to their temples the Buddhists have pictures showing people suffering the torments of hell, whither all must go for a time to be purified, unless one's "merit" is greater than one's sin. If the price is paid, the priest arranges a speedy passage from hell to heaven, or even a direct entrance to heaven, without the purgatory. Plato

teaches that before going to heaven some must first go to an underground place to suffer the punishment they have deserved. In heathen Rome it was the common creed that the heavenly fields could be reached only through a purgatory. In Virgil's *Aeneid* Anchises explains to Aeneas how souls are purified in purgatory.

Though the Bible knows no purgatory, the Roman Catholic Church has adopted this pagan notion. The Creed of Pope Pius IV says: "I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, that the souls therein detained are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful."

As to the place; Eckius will have it to be at the bottom of the sea, some will have it in Mount Etna, and Bernardus de Bustis in a hill in Ireland.

As to the torments; Sir Thomas More will have them to be only by fire; but Fisher, his fellow-sufferer, by fire and by water.

As to the executioners; Bishop Fisher will have them to be holy angels, but Sir Thomas More to be the very devils.

As to the sins; some will have them to be venial only, others say mortal too.

As to the time; Dionysius the Carthusian extends it to the end of the world, whilst Dominicus a Soto limits it to ten years; and others make it depend on the number of masses done on their behalf, or if the Pope but speak the word.

As to the torments; Aquinas makes them as violent as those of hell, but the Rhemists say the souls there are in a very fine condition.

O'Sullivan's *Catholic History of Ireland* thus describes the Purgatory of St. Patrick: "There are numbers of men whom no arithmetic can reckon up, all lying on the ground pierced through the body. They uttered hoarse cries of agony, their tongues cleaving to their jaws. They were buffeted by violent tempests, and shattered by repeated blows of devils. The devils drove them into another plain, horrible with exquisite tortures. Some, with iron chains about their necks and

limbs, were suspended over fires, others were burned with red-hot cinders. Not a few were transfixed on the spits, and roasted, melted lead being poured into them. Alas for those who do not do penance in this world!"

From such torments souls could be helped by paying priests to say mass, *i. e.*, to sacrifice Christ over and over.

"In the Archdiocese of Vienna, in 1787, the number of masses for the dead was 97,000, requiring more than 300 priests daily to perform them. In the one church of St. John and St. Paul, in Venice, the unperformed masses due at that time amounted to 16,400." A mint of money!

HOLY WATER.

The Hindus believe in the soul-cleansing power of water, and they bathe daily in the sacred rivers, and on certain holy days at certain places all sins, past, present, and future, are washed away, even the sins of the bathers' ancestors. At the coming of death the sick are taken to the banks of a sacred river, that the sight of the holy water might cleanse the soul, and afford a passport to heaven.

At the entrance to the temples of Greece and Rome there was the Amula, a vessel of holy water, where the worshiper might sprinkle himself. This water was made holy by putting into it a burning torch from the altar, representing the god of fire, or by putting salt into it.

When the heathen temples were turned into Christian churches, these lavers with the holy water were kept, and so this heathen superstition crept into the Roman Catholic Church. Some of this water is made holy on the Saturday after Good Friday, and is used for baptism and for sprinkling over the congregation. The priest divides the water in the font with his hand in the form of a cross, and then expels the evil spirits. Letting down the great Paschal candle into the water, he breathes into it three times, a little oil and a little saliva is also mixed with the water, and now this water is holy and has power to cleanse the soul from sin.

Pythagoras says, "Sea water or salt and water washes

away the sins of men." Herodotus speaks often of its common use. Justin Martyr wrote about 166: "It was invented by devils in imitation of the true baptism." Julian ordered all food brought to the market to be sprinkled with lustral water, that the Christians might either starve or be compelled to eat what they considered demoniacally polluted.

Platina says Pope Alexander I (109—119) introduced this pagan superstition.

Though the Bible knows nothing of such holy water, this heathen superstition was introduced into Romanism. "Father Newman himself admits, in regard to holy water and many other things that were the 'very instruments and appendages of demon worship,' that they were all of pagan origin, and sanctified by adoption into the Church." And Jodocus Tiletanus of Convaine says: "There are divers matters of importance and weight accepted and received, out of a doctrine which is nowhere set forth in writing (of the Bible). For we do bless the water wherewith we baptize. . . . And out of what Scripture have we learned the same? Have we not it of a secret and unwritten ordinance?"

Socrates, in his *Church History*, says this holy water was to be found in many churches at the beginning of the fourth century, but the first certain instance we have in 540 at St. Sophia, at Constantinople, under Justinian I.

The pagan Romans sprinkled their horses with holy water to guard them from evil spirits and accidents in the races in the Circensian games. The Catholic Romans did the same. They say, "Once on a time the horses of some Christians outran those of the heathen, because they were sprinkled with holy water." This superstition was brought in by St. Anthony, the patron saint of animals. On his day, January 17, the priests sprinkle all animals with a brush "in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

This Anthony preached to the fish, who listened very devoutly, as may be seen in a painting in the Pope's Vatican palace.

RELICS.

In the temple of the Olympian Zeus they kept, in a bronze casket, the shoulder bone of Pelops found in the sea, indicated by an oracle, to save the Eleans from a pestilence, also the miracle-working great toe of Pyrrhos. At Messina they have the relics of Idas; at Sparta, those of Orestes; at Tegea, the hair of Medusa. The Thebans kept the bones of Hector to insure prosperity. Plutarch tells us Cimon found the bones of Theseus, and Athens built a beautiful temple and set apart a holiday for them.

In India the goddess Parvati committed suicide, and her husband carried her body around. To lighten the burden of the poor fellow the god Vishnu kindly cut the body into fifty pieces, and wherever a part fell, a temple grew to honor it. The temples are hundreds of miles apart, and the relic of the goddess makes the temple holy.

Buddha's teeth, nails, bones, and hair are sacredly preserved and on festival days exhibited. Of course, many miracles have been wrought by these holy relics.

Such was the demand for relics of their gods, that many cities of Egypt had arms and legs of the same god.

Though the Bible forbids all superstition, this piece of heathenism was introduced by the Romanists. The traffic in relics became so shameless that the Emperor Theodosius, in 386, by an edict threatened severe punishments to all priests selling relics of saints. In 397, forty-eight bishops, in a Council at Carthage, organized the cult of the saints.

In 675, a council condemned the custom of bishops marching in procession before relics as if they were the ark of the Lord. In 787, churches could not be consecrated unless relics could be obtained. The Council of Trent rather encouraged the veneration of relics; the creed of Pius IV declares, "That the relics of saints are to be venerated."

At Braley Priory there was a red girdle of Mary and a white girdle of the Magdalen, which were rented out to women; Mary's was the more expensive one. A piece of Thomas's

shirt hastened birth; a bottle of Mary's milk helped nursing mothers.

The Pope gave to the Emperor of Austria as a special favor what was declared to be a tooth of St. Peter—in the 19th century.

Dr. Manning writes Cardinal Wiseman: "The Archbishop of Milan received me very kindly and has given me two relics of the blood of St. Charles. There was no portion of the body to be obtained." (Of St. Charles Borromeo, a branch of whose order was to be established in England.)

The Romanists show the handkerchief with which Veronica wiped Christ's face; the reed and the sponge of vinegar offered to Him on the cross; the nails which pierced His hands and feet; the spear which was thrust into His side; the column to which He was tied during the scourging; the thorns of His crown; His blood and hair; His manger; the napkin about His head in the tomb. No less than twenty cathedrals show His seamless robe. Enough pieces of the cross are shown to make many crosses. They explain that God multiplied this as He multiplied the loaves and fishes.

The Romanists show the Virgin's hair, milk, girdle, veil, shreds of her garments, and her house, brought by angels from Syria to Loreto, in Italy.

They show the heads of Peter and Paul and portions of their body.

Jerome tells us Arcadius brought the bones of Samuel from Judea to Thrace.

Charles the Great helped find the blood, hair, and garments of John Baptist, the bones of Zacharias, some memorials of Simeon. Some of Noah's beard was on view in the 14th century.

Louis IX bought for a fabulous sum a twisted wreath of brambles said to be the "true crown of thorns." There are about 150 "true nails" wherewith Christ was nailed to the cross; enough wood of the "true cross" to lade a goodly ship. There are twelve heads of John Baptist.

They show the footprints of the Savior, just as the old heathen showed the footprints of the feet of Hercules and Theseus.

To St. Veronica's handkerchief Pope John XXII composed this prayer: "Hail, holy Face of our Redeemer, printed upon a cloth as white as snow; purge us from all spots of vice, and join us to the company of the Blessed! Bring us to our country, O Happy Figure, there to see the pure Face of Christ!"

Pope Urban VIII built an altar to Veronica in St. Peter's Cathedral. According to Pope Innocent III this handkerchief grants ten days' indulgence to all visitors. When in Rome, Luther saw this relic.

St. Aureliana, "the virgin martyr of the proud and royal Aurelian family," was taken from the catacombs after sixteen centuries and taken to the convent of the St. Franciscan Sisters at Cincinnati, and the Archbishop asks all devout Catholics to pray for her help, according to the *Freeman's Journal* of September 24, 1870.

"Archbishop Sebastian G. Messmer presented last night to St. Gall's Church, 1018 Third Street, a relic of the saint for whom the church is named, having brought the relic back with him from his recent visit to his native land, Switzerland. In his presentation address the archbishop expressed the pleasure it gave him to bring to a church of his diocese, named for the saint who came as an apostle from Ireland to bring Christianity to Switzerland, a relic of that saint. Eighteen priests were in the procession, the entire congregation, and 100 children, the services closing with the benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. The relic, which is a bone of the saint, will be exposed during public services in the church on the altar dedicated to St. Gall."

A Modernist's Letters to His Holiness Pope Pius X says: "The evidences of superstition, of a religion of amulets, charms, and relics, may be seen wherever Roman Catholicism has set foot." (p. 97.)

"If the pagan Greeks venerated the hair of Medusa, the

lyre of Orpheus, and the vessels of Agamemnon, a Christian people are quite on a line with them in prostrating before a mythical wristbone of St. Ann or the rod of Moses, still kept in St. John Lateran, or the breath of Christ at Genoa, or the window through which the Angel Gabriel entered the house of Mary, or the disgusting relic of St. Bartholomew, once revered at Treves. Neither could it ever serve any conceivable benefit to religion that high honors have been paid to twenty different bodies of John the Baptist, eighteen of St. Paul, six heads of Ignatius Martyr, sixty fingers of St. Jerome, forty holy shrouds, and seven hundred thorns from the sacred crown. Nor can intelligent people be profitably present at a mass or office of St. Josaphat when they know that he is none other than Buddha; or at a panegyric of St. Veronica, when they are aware that originally she was the gnostic principle of generation. It is difficult, too, to arouse devotion to St. Apollinaris, a lineal descendant of Apollo, or to Cosmas and Damian, who have succeeded to the place of Castor and Pollux." (pp. 99, 100.)

Milwaukee, Wis.

W. DALLMANN.

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

THE SECOND ARTICLE.

THE WORK OF REDEMPTION.

(Continued.)

Rev. 5, 9: *Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood.*

Then, Christ, *wast slain*, as the only offering well pleasing to God. Thus we were *redeemed*, bought back from the slavery of sin and iniquity, from the servitude of Satan, and became Christ's own, Eph. 5, 2; Hebr. 9, 14. Thou hast given *Thy blood* as the redemption-money, as a ransom, to the Judge, and it had the power to quench God's wrath. For Thy blood is God's blood, Acts 20, 28. — Indeed, we are bought with a price,

1 Cor. 6, 19. Now by right of purchase we Christians are Christ's own, and He is our Lord.

Is. 53, 11: *He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied: by His knowledge shall my righteous Servant justify many; for He shall bear their iniquities.*

This passage speaks of the redemptive work of Christ. "*He shall see of the travail of His soul.*" Christ suffered not only in His body, but also in His soul. His *soul*, too, was *in travail*. The work is accomplished. Now He shall see the fruits of this travail. As v. 10 expresses it: "He shall see His seed" — the *ecclesia* — "and shall be satisfied." (Acts 20, 28.) He has bought the Church of God with His own blood. The Gospel is preached. Sinners, who have caused the travail of His soul, are won thereby. They acclaim Him their King. This the exalted Christ views with satisfaction. He took away the sin of the world, John 1, 29: He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, 1 John 2, 2. He bought even them that deny Him, 2 Pet. 2, 1. He would have all men to be saved, but, alas! of many He must weepingly complain: "Ye would not." But still there are some who receive Him, believe in Him. These constitute the Church. As these believers are added to the Church, either one by one, or in great numbers, Christ sees of the travail of His soul, and views it with great satisfaction. His work bears results. "*He shall see and be satisfied with the travail of His soul.*" "*By His knowledge shall my righteous Servant justify many.*" Christ, the righteous Servant, shall *justify* many, shall make many righteous. He is not only righteous in Himself, but also the one who makes others — sinners — righteous, righteous before God. The means with which He accomplishes this is expressed in the phrase: "*by His knowledge.*" or as it may also be translated: "*by the knowledge of Himself.*" Both renditions say the same thing essentially. "By the knowledge of Himself" says that the many shall know Him = believe in Him. The former, "by His knowledge," says: Christ possesses this knowledge. This knowledge He imparts to others. The contents of this knowledge are

essentially Christ's sufferings and death, their purpose and effect, in short, the Gospel of our salvation. Through it Christ imparts knowledge, knowledge of Himself as the Savior, implants faith in the heart. Thus the righteousness merited by Him is applied to the many—they are justified, made righteous before God. Thus the many are robed in Christ's righteousness. This Christ sees, and is satisfied with the travail of His soul.

An outflow of this righteousness of faith is the righteousness of life. Before God the believers are holy, but their life is still imperfect. Iniquities—sins—are still to be found on account of the weakness of the flesh. We need consolation therefor. It is this: "*For (and) He shall bear their iniquities.*" By one offering Christ has perfected forever them that are sanctified. But this offering, this propitiation, has continuous power. The exalted Christ is our Advocate with the Father; the righteousness which He, the sin-bearer, merited for us, 1 John 2, 1. 2. He makes His plea. Thus our sins of weakness cannot subvert our state of righteousness before God.

NOTE.—For passages sub § 158 see THEOL. QUART., current volume, p. 128.

STATE OF EXALTATION.

Phil. 2, 9—11: *Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth: and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.*

Treating of Christ's state of humiliation (THEOL. QUART., p. 120), we have seen that divine majesty was communicated to His human nature in virtue of the personal union, but that, though He possessed it, He did not make use of it constantly and fully.

The present passage speaks of Christ's exaltation. Wherein does it consist? The text says: "*Wherefore God hath also highly exalted Him.*" In the previous paragraph we were told what Christ had done; in this we are informed what God did.

God exalted Christ. *Wherefore?* Because this mind was in Christ, v. 5, because He humiliated Himself so deeply. This was so well pleasing to God that He exalted Christ. According to Scripture, God exalted Christ, and Christ exalted Himself. Hebr. 1, 3. The one dictum does not exclude the other. Here it is predicated of God. God did this — exalted Christ. That does not argue for subordination, does not say that Christ is inferior to God the Father. Whom did God exalt? The *man* Christ. Christ is true God. According to His divine nature He could not be exalted. He is “over all God.” But according to His human nature He could be and was exalted. In the state of humiliation the Savior took upon Himself the form of a servant, v. 7. In the state of exaltation this form of a servant was discarded. In the former state He did not fully and constantly use the divine majesty imparted to His human nature; now He does. Observe the adverb “highly.” He is *highly exalted*, ὑπερέβησεν, that says, He is exalted above *all things*. He is Lord of all, and mightily rules and reigns over all things also according to His human nature — rules, as the context manifests, mightily in the kingdom of glory, in the kingdom of grace, in the kingdom of power. He has “*a name above all names*” — none is higher, greater than His. Christ is God like unto the Father. The man Christ is the most high God. “Exaltation” signifies a change of Christ’s state, not a change of His essence. The incarnate λόγος was always the same, only His mode of existence was different; hence we speak of His two states, the state of humiliation and the state of exaltation.

God gave “*Him a name which is above every name*,” *sc.*, the name Jesus. And what was the purpose of His exaltation? “*That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow*,” etc. That clearly says, as Paul expresses it: “He is far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come,” Eph. 1, 20—22. *At the name of Jesus every knee should bow* — so highly God exalted Him. Divine honor is to

be accorded to this name. At the name of Jesus *every knee should bow*, that is, acknowledge Him as Lord. Jesus, the man Jesus, is thus to be honored. Three classes of creatures are mentioned that should thus accord divine honor to His name: "*things in heaven*" — angels and saints; "*things in earth*" — all mankind; "*things under the earth*" — Satan and his hellish cohorts. For a time He had become lower than the angels, Hebr. 2, 7. Voluntarily He had taken upon Himself the form of a servant — to serve, to save man. Voluntarily He had subjected Himself to the power of the Evil One. But after that cry on the cross, "It is finished!" all pain, poverty, subjection had come to an end. Now, in the state of exaltation, all creatures, whatsoever name they may have, wherever they may be, how great soever their power may be, are subjected to Him, bow and must bow their knees to Him, acknowledge Him as Lord of all. The angels in heaven do it willingly, likewise the believers on earth, and the unbelievers must do so, though unwillingly. Secretly, in their heart of hearts, they are forced to confess that He is Lord. Even the very devils in hell must acknowledge Christ's lordship, even they, albeit with gnashing of teeth, must concede that they cannot hinder His will.

Highly God exalted Christ. How highly? He has a name above every name; every knee must bow before Him; every tongue must confess Him Lord. Verily, this man Jesus is "God over all!" "Thou madest Him a little lower than the angels; Thou crownedst Him with glory and honor, and didst set Him over the works of Thy hands: Thou hast put all things in subjection under His feet. For in that He put all in subjection under Him, He left nothing that is not put under Him," Hebr. 2, 7, 8.

And this was done, says our text, "*to the glory of God the Father.*" God's decree from eternity was to save man through His Son. This decree has been carried out. "All glory be to God on high." All enemies are subdued. God's power, holiness, righteousness, wisdom, love, mercy, His truth and faithfulness, have become manifest in Christ's redemptive work.

Descent into Hell.

1 Pet. 3, 18, 19: *Christ was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison.*

1. Who descended into hell? "*For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, . . . being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit . . . went.*" Christ went. This person, who is at once true man and true God, went: the whole person, with body and soul, went. It is the same person that afterwards, as the subsequent context shows, ascended into heaven. So it is wrong to say, as some do, that this descent took place while Christ's body lay in the grave, and that He performed this work according to His soul only. Let us observe the text closely: "*For Christ*" — that is, the God-man, the whole person, "*being put to death in the flesh*" — Christ died according to His human nature, "*but*" — He did not remain in death — "*but quickened by the Spirit.*" *i. e.*, made alive by virtue of His divine nature, as He said, speaking of His death: "Break this temple," meaning His body, "*and in three days I will raise it up.*" So Christ, who suffered and died for us, was quickened, vivified, made alive: body and soul were reunited. This same Christ, now in a glorified state, went.

2. According to what nature did He go? According to His human nature, for as God He is omnipresent and cannot be said to go anywhere. On account of the personal union of the natures in Christ, this going to a certain place, which is a property of the one nature only, is predicated of the whole person. So Christ, the God-man, went to this place designated "*prison.*"

3. Now what are we to understand by this term? Light is shed upon the nature of this place by the text itself. It reads: Christ "*went and preached to the spirits in prison.*" What spirits? To the spirits "*which sometime were disobedient.*" Disobedient to what? To the Word of God. The Gospel had been preached to them, but they turned a deaf ear to it, just as so many do to-day. "*In the days of Noah*" people

were "*disobedient*," they *believed not*. These people perished in the Flood. And these disobedient people, dying in unbelief, are now in *prison*. Whither do unbelieving people go? To hell. This prison is hell. "He that believeth not shall be damned." "Prison" is the abode of the damned — hell. According to all the teachings of Scriptures there are but two places hereafter, heaven and hell. To designate this latter place — hell — the New Testament employs three words: Hell, Hades, Prison. All three denote the same place — hell. This place is called "hell" on account of the *fiery* tortures there to be endured. The same place is called "Hades" — "the realm of the dead" — in reference to the *eternal* death. Once in Hades, death is everlasting. Hades is hell, ay, "Hades" is a direct synonym for "hell" in the New Testament, all the vain mouthings of the modern theologians to the contrary notwithstanding. It does not take great acumen of mind to see this. Luke 16, 23. 24 speaks of the rich man in hell. Our King James's Version correctly and plainly renders the text thus: "And in *hell* he (the rich man) lift up his eyes." The Revised Version says: "And in *Hades* he lift up his eyes." Hades, the modern theologians would have us believe, is a sort of quiet anteroom to heaven, a waiting-room, and, withal, a pretty comfortable place. All this is mere twaddle. Judge for yourselves! Take the text of the Revised Version: "And in *Hades* he lift up his eyes, *being in torments*." So Hades is a place of torments, of excruciating pain. Hades is hell. We read on: "And seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom." Abraham and Lazarus were in heaven; the rich man *afar off* in that other place — hell. "And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me!" The rich man, being in Hades, was in a place where no mercy is shown. Hades is hell. Proceed with the text: "And send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue." Hades is a place of such a nature that, being granted one drop of water to alleviate the terrible torments there endured for the hundredth part of a second, this is looked upon as great mercy. Hades is hell. The

rich man continues: "For I am tormented in this flame." Hades is a place where the inmates are tormented in the *flame* — in fire. Hades is hell. — The translation of the King James's Version is true; so is Luther's: "Als er in der *Hoelle* und in der Qual war."

The third word the New Testament employs to describe "hell" is the one in our text — *prison*. Prison this place of torment is called to indicate its *purpose*. Hell is a prison from which there is no escape. Matt. 5, 26 our Lord Himself speaks of this prison, saying of such as enter it: "Verily, I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing." When will that be? Never. — Thus "hell," "Hades," "prison," all denote one and the same place, "that place which is prepared for the devil and his angels," that place of which, in reference to the unbelievers, it is said: "Their worm shall not die, neither their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring to all flesh." To this place Christ went.

4. When did He go? That question is easily answered by consulting the text. V. 18 speaks of Christ's suffering, death, and quickening; v. 19, of *His descent into hell*; v. 21, of His resurrection; v. 22, of His ascent into heaven and His sitting at the right hand of God; chap. 4, 5, of His return to judgment. Thus the time is clearly marked. It was after His quickening and before His resurrection. In that interval, perhaps in a moment of time, the now glorified Christ appeared in the nether world.

5. What was His purpose in going there? The text answers: "*to preach*." Despite this plain, unmistakable assertion, there are such as teach that Christ descended to hell to suffer the torments of hell for us. This is absolutely false. It does not only do violence to this text, but it is contrary to the words of our Savior uttered on the cross: "It is finished." — Nor was His purpose in going there to release the Old Testament saints from prison (*limbus patrum*), as the papists aver. He went there *to preach*.

6. What did He preach? There are such as say that He preached the Gospel in order to give those who had no opportunity to hear the Gospel in this life another chance to hear of, and accept, the merits of Christ and thus be saved. This is absolutely false again, for the text plainly says Christ preached to such as were "sometime disobedient," who would not believe. This thought, that the Gospel was preached in hell, is furthermore expanded, and the possibility of conversion after death for all is taught by most modern theologians. This dogma, which is but the doctrine of purgatory of the Catholics, furbished and polished up somewhat, has no foundation in Scripture, as even some noted leaders who promulgate it honestly concede: but the thought is fascinating to them, and thus they teach "commandments," or rather figments, "of men as doctrines of God." It is a soul-destroying doctrine, which fosters carnal security. It is a religion of the flesh. People are led to think: "Well and good, it matters not how I live or die here on earth, after death I'll have another chance, and I'll be sure to embrace it." Oh, how much these seducers of souls will have to answer for on that Great Day, for it is written: "It is appointed unto men once to die, but thereafter"—what? a millennium? a state of second probation? a possibility of conversion? No, a thousand times no!—"but thereafter the judgment." There is no conversion after death. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." And what does the text of the rich man and Lazarus teach? "The rich man died and was buried." And the very next thing? "And in hell he lift up his eyes," etc., Luke 16, 19. No conversion after death! "He that believeth not is condemned already because he hath not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God," John 3, 18 ff. — All Scripture is against this false tenet, and they that hold it get no consolation from our text. For nowhere does it say here that Christ preached the Gospel. It simply says: Christ *preached*. The word in the original is a word of neutral meaning, which, translated, means *to preach, to proclaim, to publish*

as a herald. This is conceded by all conversant with the matter. How, then, do we know what Christ did preach? The context must give us a key to that. And the context is plain, forceful, cogent, so that any one open to conviction, any one who investigates it with an unbiased mind, without preconceived opinions, cannot be left in doubt as to its meaning. Christ preached the Law, the damning Law: He told them in effect: "You are justly damned." Let us see that! "*Christ preached to the spirits in prison which sometime were disobedient when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a-preparing.*" What does the text say? 1. These people were *disobedient*. The Gospel had been preached to them during their lifetime. They despised it. "He that believeth not shall be damned." This Christ preached to them. "You have despised me, spurned my Gospel message: your lot is just." 2. God was *long-suffering once*. But now His long-suffering had come to an end; *once*—during their lifetime: now—no more. 3. God *waited*. He had waited 120 years! God had given them a long time to repent: He had done all to save them. 4. God had sent them the preacher of righteousness, Noah, to warn them of the impending doom if they should not repent. 5. The building of the ark itself was an object sermon. They despised Noah, and ridiculed the building of the ark. Thus we see the *guilt, the damning guilt*, of these people is stressed. And the correlative of guilt is punishment. 6. If the modern theologians were in the right, who maintain that the Gospel was here preached by Christ, we should at least expect to hear of a mitigating circumstance, an excuse for the disobedience of the spirits in prison. But no, nothing of the kind. *Their guilt is emphasized, and guilt demands punishment*. Whosoever despises the grace of God must be punished. The doctrine taught here is: *Unbelief is a cause of damnation*. So, then, it was not the Gospel that Christ preached, but the Law, the judgment.

The exact words of this sermon are not given, but the import of it was: "You have despised me, whom you now see to

be the victor over death, and hell, and sin: you are justly damned." Thus "Christ, having been quickened in His grave, exhibited Himself to hell as its conqueror, and triumphed over all His infernal enemies." He has, as we read in Col. 2, 15, "spoiled principalities and powers, He made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it."

Springfield, Ill.

LOUIS WESSEL.

(To be continued.)

LUTHER'S VIEWS ON LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.

We say and pray in our general church prayer that the Lord of lords would graciously preserve our country unimpaired in its liberty. The most precious of the liberties of our country is religious liberty, or freedom of conscience. The first seeds of this liberty were brought to this country by spiritual descendants of Doctor Martin Luther. In the twenty-eight resolutions drawn up at Stockholm, August 15, 1642, by Oxenstierna, the chancellor under Gustavus Adolphus, and others for the proper regulation of the Swedish colony established in 1638 on the banks of the Delaware, the colonists were charged not to disturb the Holland colonists who might settle among them "in the indulgence granted them as to the exercise of the Reformed religion." Such an instruction would not have been possible if Luther had not lived in the sixteenth century. Says Peter Bayne, LL. D.:¹⁾ "Anglo-Saxondom thanks Luther, next, for freedom of conscience. For more than a thousand years it had been the law of Europe that the heretic should be put to death; and the death assigned to heresy was fire. Hating and fearing heresy with an intensity of emotion which in our age the most imaginative can but feebly realize, Luther . . . declared that this method of dealing with the heretic was wrong from top to bottom. Were it otherwise, he said, the hangman would be the best theologian." The Reformed theologian Schaff

1) Martin Luther. His Life and Work, vol. I, p. 8. Cassell and Company, 1881.

declares: "Luther's bold stand at the Diet of Worms, in the face of the Pope and the Emperor, is one of the sublimest events in the history of liberty. If liberty, both civil and religious, has since made progress, it is due in large measure to the inspiration of that heroic act."² "On this, as on so many other subjects, Luther was in advance of all his contemporaries, and, as Schaff further admits, 'has left some of the noblest utterances against coercion in matters of conscience, which contain almost every essential feature of the modern theory on the subject.'"³

THE THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY presents some of these utterances in an English translation. They are arranged in chronological order. The translation has been made from the St. Louis edition of Luther's complete works.

Luther's written reply to Cajetan at Augsburg, October 14, 1518: "Only that I be not compelled to do anything against the conviction of my conscience." (Vol. XV, 584, 57.)

Letter to Cajetan, Sunday, October 17, 1518: "I should most willingly . . . recant everything if in any way my conscience would permit it. For I know that I ought to yield to no man's command, advice, or favor to such an extent as to say or do anything against my conscience." (XV, 591, 7.)

"To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation," published about the middle of August, 1520: "Therefore it is a mischievous invention, and they are not able to produce a single letter to prove that it rests with the pope alone to interpret the Scriptures or to approve their interpretation; they have assumed the right to themselves. . . . Besides that, we are all priests, as I have said, and have all one faith, one Gospel, one sacrament; how, then, should we not also have the power of tasting and judging what is right or wrong in matters of faith? What becomes of St. Paul's words, 1 Cor. 2, 15: 'He that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man;' and also 2 Cor. 4, 13: 'We having the same spirit of

2) The Lutheran Cyclopedia, p. 407 f.

3) Ibid.

faith'? Why, then, should we not perceive, as well as an unbelieving pope, what agrees or disagrees with faith? . . . We should overcome heretics with books, not with fire, as the old Fathers did. If learning consisted in overcoming heretics with fire, the executioners would be the most learned Doctors on earth." (X, 278, 22. 23. 130.)

Letter to Spalatin at Worms, January 16, 1521: "You see what Hutten seeks." (Hutten had requested that Spalatin sound the Elector whether he would permit him and Sickingen, in case of need, to seek shelter in his domains, and thus aid and abet them in their plans to overthrow the papacy with fire and sword.) "I would not have any one contend for the Gospel with violence and bloodshed: thus I have written to the man. By the Word the world has been overcome; by the Word the Church has been preserved; by the Word also it will be restored: and Antichrist also, as he rose without hand, so will he be destroyed without hand by the Word." (XV, 2506, 2.)

Luther's reply at Worms, Thursday, April 18, 1521: "Unless I be convicted by testimonies of the Scriptures, or by evident reason,—for I believe neither the pope nor the councils alone, since it is evident that they have often erred and contradicted one another,—I am vanquished by the Scriptures adduced by me, and my conscience is bound in the words of God; I neither can nor will recant anything, since it is neither safe nor honest to do anything against conscience. Here I stand; I cannot do otherwise; God help me! Amen."

To the Archbishop and Elector of Treves Luther said at Worms, April 25, 1521: "The pope is not judge in matters pertaining to God's Word and faith; but every Christian man must see and judge for himself, even as he must live and die according to it; for faith and God's Word are the property of every one in the whole congregation. This I proved by St. Paul: 'If anything be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace,' 1 Cor. 14, 30. From this passage it plainly appears that the master ought to follow the scholar

if the latter has a better opinion supported by the words of God." (XV, 1915, 8.)

Letter to Melanchthon, about the middle of May, 1521 (XV, 1907): "I hear that at Erfurt they are resorting to violence against the dwellings of priests; I am surprised that the city council permits it and connives at it, and that our friend Lang does not speak against it."

Of Confession, June 1, 1521 (XIX, 832, 33. 71. 75—77. 86): "The civil government does not undertake to govern men's consciences; it deals only with temporal goods. . . . For in the conscience God wants to be alone and to have His Word rule alone; here there must be freedom from all commandments of men. . . . As our first proof we adduce the saying found in the legend of St. John the Evangelist: *Non placent Deo coacta servitia*. Forced or unwilling service is not pleasing to God. And even if this legend did not say so, Scripture teaches it throughout.—Though He demands the observance of His laws and requires it of every one, still He takes no pleasure in those who observe them reluctantly, by constraint, from fear of punishment, and not freely and willingly. . . . But if He does not wish to have His Law kept with reluctance and by constraint, how much less will it please Him if men are compelled to accept His counsel and promises which are not divine demands!—It is far more tolerable that people be compelled to observe His laws than that they be compelled to accept His counsels and promises. Take an example: Suppose some rich person should obligate himself by a promise that on a certain day he would give to all needy persons a good garment which would be useful to none but the individual recipient himself; but seeing that they refused to accept it, you fool, prompted by your kind intentions, thought you would help matters by urging and constraining them to receive it, knowing full well that they would not keep it, but throw it into a corner; what sort of service do you miserable wiseacre suppose you were doing the rich man whom you wished to help dispose of his substance in such a foolish manner? He would

suppose you to be insane or his greatest enemy; for the saying is true, You cannot give to any one without his will and consent, but you can take away from him without his thanks. Behold, this is precisely what you senseless, raging pope and your sect are doing, you worst enemies of God! . . . Likewise I would preach faith and baptism; I would, however, compel none to receive it, but would accept all that would come of their own accord. In the same manner I would preach the grace of the Sacrament of the Altar; but leave it free, compelling none to partake of it."

During Luther's stay at the Wartburg, the Zwickau prophets came to Wittenberg, and, together with Carlstadt, held their iconoclastic orgies. In a letter to Spalatin, dated January 17, 1522 (XV, 2606), Luther says in reference to these "heavenly prophets": "Still I should not like to have them put in prison, particularly by those who espouse our cause. . . . See also that our prince does not stain his hands with the blood of these new prophets."

On his return to Wittenberg he preached a course of eight sermons on the crisis, March 9—13, 1522. (XX, 17, 3—6; 8—10.) "The mass is an evil thing, and God hates it, in that it is celebrated as if it were a sacrifice and meritorious work; therefore it ought to be abolished. Nevertheless, love should not proceed harshly in this matter, removing the mass by force. It should be preached, it should be written and declared that the mass, celebrated in such manner, is a sinful thing; however, no one should be taken by the hair and pulled away from it; but the matter should rather be left to God, and we should let His Word work alone, without our concurrent effort or labor. Why? Because I do not hold in my hand the hearts of men, as the potter holds the clay, to do with them as I please; even as God holds all men's hearts in His hand to convert or to harden them, Jer. 18, 6; Rom. 9, 21. I can come no further with the Word than into the ears; into the heart I cannot come. Since faith cannot be poured into the heart, no one can nor should be forced or compelled to it; for God does

that alone, quickening the Word in men's hearts when and where He wills, according to His divine knowledge and good pleasure. Hence we should give free course to the Word, and not add our efforts to it. We have *jus verbi*, and not *executionem*, that is, we shall preach the Word, but leave the result to God alone.

"But if I act hastily, purposing to abolish this abuse of the mass by violence, there will be many who must join in the movement without knowing whether it be right or wrong, saying, I do not know what to think of it; I had to follow the congregation, the multitude, and force; thereby they get an erring, uneasy conscience of which they can afterwards hardly get rid again. And the compulsory law produces merely a sham, an outward show, apery, and a human ordinance, which begets seeming saints, hypocrites, and dissemblers. For sincerity of heart, and faith, and love are wanting. Where these three elements are lacking in a deed, it may be ever so righteous and good, it will amount to nothing; I would not give the stem of a pear for it.

"We must first win the people's heart; and this is done when I use the Word of God, preaching the Gospel, telling the people their error, and saying, Dear sirs, dear priests, dear papists, abandon the mass; your way of celebrating it is not right, you are sinning thereby and provoking God's wrath; I have now told you. I would, however, make no laws for them, nor insist on a common order. Whoever would be willing to follow, would follow; whoever would be unwilling, would stay away.

"If this were done, the Word would to-day fall into this man's heart, to-morrow into another's, and cause him to surrender now and judge himself guilty of having erred in this matter, and he would go his way and abandon the mass of his own accord. Thus God would effect more by His Word than if you, and I, and the whole world were to combine all power. For by the Word God conquers the heart; when the heart is conquered, you have won the whole man. Then the thing must finally fall and cease of itself. . . . I do not say this because

I wish to establish the mass again; no, let it lie in God's name; since it is fallen, let it be fallen. However, this we must bear in mind, and constantly preach it, that faith must not be seized and bound, nor by any kind of order joined to any work. Follow this rule and none other! By such storming and violence you will not effect your object; mark my words! . . .

"In brief, I will preach it, I will declare it, I will write it, but none will I force and constrain by violence; for faith must be voluntary and unconstrained, and must be embraced without compulsion."

Letter to Nic. Hausmann, March 17, 1522 (XV, 2011): "See that you do not permit any innovations to be introduced by a common order or by violence; by the Word alone those things must be attacked, overthrown, and abolished which our people have undertaken to abolish by force and violence. Thus Satan has driven them. . . . I denounce and reject by the Word alone. Whoever believes may believe and follow; whoever does not believe may disbelieve and go his way. For to faith, and whatever pertains to faith, no one must be compelled, but rather drawn by the Word, so that the willing believer comes of his free will."

Letter to Nic. Hausmann, March 26, 1522 (XXIa, 385 f.): "We deal with these matters by means of the Word alone, teaching what the Gospel contains concerning the mass and communion, and forcing none to abstain from it, or to take part in its celebration. Let every man's conscience see to it that he respond to the Gospel, till all grow and all become Evangelical."

To the city council of Altenburg, April 28, 1522 (XXIa, 397): "If they should say that it is not for us to judge which is the Gospel, or that it has not as yet been decided by a council: this we do not concede to them; for Scripture does not authorize a council, but each and every Christian to judge of doctrines, 1 Cor. 14, 29, and to know and avoid the wolves, Matt. 7, 15, and does not refer to what others decide, even though they were angels, but to every one's conscience; for every one must

believe for himself and know the difference between true and false doctrine; for 'he that believeth shall be saved.'"

Sermon on the 8th Sunday after Trinity, Matt. 7, 15—22 (XI, 1394, 3. 4 ff.): "Christ, our Lord, here commands and authorizes all Christians to be judges of all doctrine, granting them the right to decide what is right or wrong. Among the false Christians this point of doctrine has been changed and perverted for us for nigh unto a thousand years so that we had no right to judge, but simply had to accept without any examination what the pope and the councils decided.

"Now the Gospel under consideration completely overthrows popery and all councils: for we are not obliged to observe what the pope commands and what men decree. Hence I say once more, Grasp well this Gospel; for neither the pope nor the councils, nor any one is given authority to decree and decide what is faith. For Christ says, 'Beware of false prophets!' Either the Gospel must be lying, or else the pope and his councils. Christ says: We have the right to judge all doctrines and whatever we are commanded to do or not to do. Here the Lord is not speaking to the pope, however, but to all Christians. And just as the precept, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them,' is given to all, even so these words, 'Beware of false prophets!' exclude no one. Whence it clearly follows that I may indeed judge of doctrine.

"Hence I am to say, Pope, you and your councils have made decrees; now I have the power to judge whether or no I may accept them. Why? Because you will not stand and answer for me when I must die, but I must see for myself where I stand, that I may be certain.

"For you must be so certain that it is God's Word as certain you are that you are living, nay, even more certain; for on this alone your conscience must rest. Even if all men should come, yes, the angels too, and all the world decide something, if you cannot grasp nor form the judgment, you are lost; for you must not base your opinion on the pope nor on any one else; you must be able to say for yourself, This God

says, that He does not say; this is right, that is wrong; otherwise it is not possible for you to stand.

"For if in the hour of death you rely on the pope and the councils, saying, The pope has said this, the councils have decided that, the holy Fathers, Augustine, Ambrose, have so voted, then the devil can soon make a loophole and insinuate the question, What if this be false? What if they had erred? When you experience such a temptation, you have already been overcome. Therefore you must play it safely, so that you may boldly and confidently say, This is God's Word; on this I will risk my life and a thousand necks, if I had them. . . .

"They begin to say, however, But how can we know what is God's Word, and what is true or false? We must learn this of the pope and councils. Never mind! Let them decide and declare what they like; but I say, You cannot put your confidence in that nor satisfy your conscience, you must decide for yourself; your neck is at stake, your life is at stake. Therefore God must say to your heart, This is God's Word; otherwise there will be no decision."

To the church at Erfurt, July 10, 1522 (XIX, 962, 10): "Do as St. Paul says (Tit. 3, 10. 11): 'A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject, knowing that he that is such is subverted.' Teach with simplicity and give an account of your faith with gentleness. Whoever does not follow let him refuse to follow; whoever seduces may seduce; whoever creates a stench may create a stench still; whoever hallows may hallow still. You are excused; God will judge right; you can give to no man without his thanks.—I pray also, my dear brethren, that you would earnestly see to it that no disturbance be raised by our people, nor any occasion be given for it. There are many mischievous people who mean to aid the cause of the Gospel with swords and fists, and suppose they have done all when they abuse and harm priests and monks. They know not, however, that we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against spiritual wickedness in high places. Satan is a spirit, having neither flesh nor bones; wherefore he cannot be hurt with iron or fists. We must first wrest men's hearts

from him by the Word of Truth, that being our sword and fist which none are able to resist: with this weapon the friends of Christ cleave Behemoth in twain. See by what means I have discomfited popery and the papal hierarchy, which heretofore appeared so frightful to all the world, when people were singing, Who is able to make war with the beast? For it had power to make war even with the saints and to overcome them. (Rev. 13, 4. 7.) Yet I have never lifted a finger against it, but Christ slew it with the spirit of His mouth."

Letter to the church at Leisnig, January, 1523 (X, 954, 6): "No one is to be forced to believe and to receive the Gospel."

"That a Christian Assembly or Congregation has the Right and Authority to Judge all Doctrine," etc., 1523 (X, 1540, 3): "In this matter of judging doctrine, inducting and deposing teachers or pastors, we must pay no attention whatsoever to human tradition, law, ancient custom, usage, etc., whether it be established by pope or emperor, by princes or bishops, whether half the world or the whole world have so held, whether it have obtained one or a thousand years. For the soul of man is eternal, transcending all that is temporal; wherefore it must be ruled and held only with the eternal Word. For it is quite outrageous to rule men's consciences in matters divine with commandments of men and long-standing custom. . . .

"The word and doctrine of men have declared and ordained that the matter of judging doctrine should be left to the bishops, the learned, and the councils alone; that their decisions should be judged to be true and articles of faith, as their daily boasting about the papal canons sufficiently proves. For one can hear next to nothing out of their mouth besides this boast, that the right and authority to judge what is Christian or heretical belongs to them, and that the Christian layman ought to await their decision and abide by the same. This boast, by which they have terrorized the whole world, and which is their highest rock and confidence, behold, how insolently and foolishly it runs counter to the law and Word of God!

"For Christ declares quite the contrary, taking away from the bishops, the learned, and the councils both the right and the power of judging concerning doctrine, and giving it to every one and to all Christians alike, saying, John 10, 4. 5: 'My sheep know my voice.' 'My sheep know not the voice of strangers.'

"Here you see plainly, indeed, to whom the right of judging doctrine belongs. Bishop, pope, learned men, and any one has the right to teach; but the sheep are to judge whether they teach the voice of Christ or the voice of strangers. What are those bubbles able to say against this who clamor and cry, Councils, councils! Why, you must hear the learned, the bishops, the majority, you must have regard to ancient usage and custom!? Do you suppose God's Word must give way to your ancient usage, custom, and bishops? Never! Therefore we let bishops and councils decide and declare what they like; but when we have the Word of God on our side, it must rest with us, and not with them, to say whether it is true or false, and they must yield to us and obey our Word.

"Here, methinks, you certainly see plainly enough what is to be expected of those who manage the soul with the word of men. Who fails to see now that all bishops, chapters, cloisters, and universities with all their members rave and rant against this clear word of Christ, in that they insolently take the right of judgment of doctrine from the sheep and arrogate it to themselves by their own wicked decree! Wherefore they are certainly to be held as murderers and thieves, wolves and apostate Christians, being openly convicted here not only of denying God's Word, but likewise of ordaining and acting contrary to it. . . .

"Again Christ says, Matt. 7, 15: 'Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.' Observe that here Christ grants the right of judgment not to the prophets and teachers, but to the scholars and sheep. For how could one beware of false prophets if he were not to consider, examine, and judge their doctrine? Fur-

thermore, the false prophets are in no way among the hearers, but only among the teachers. Hence all teachers must necessarily be subject to the judgment of their hearers.

"Again, the third statement is that of St. Paul, 1 Thess. 5, 21: 'Prove all things; hold fast that which is good!' Note that here he will have no doctrine or decree held till it has been proved and recognized as good by the congregation that hears it. For this proving is not the business of the teachers; on the contrary, the teachers must first speak those things which are to be proved. Thus here also the judgment is taken from the teachers, and given to the scholars among the Christians."

"How Ministers are to be Chosen and Ordained," 1523 and 1524 (X, 1586, 65): "Christ teaches us that every one should consider his own welfare and salvation for himself, that he may know and be certain what to believe and whom to follow; that he is likewise a free, authorized judge of all that would teach him, being inwardly taught of God alone, John 6, 45. For you will not be damned or saved by another's doctrine, be it false or true, but by your belief alone. Another may teach and preach what he pleases, but it is for you to take heed at your greatest loss or gain what you believe."

When Luther's translation of the New Testament was eagerly bought and read everywhere as the most popular book of the day, Duke George of Albertine Saxony under severe penalties forbade his people to have it in their possession. This edict called forth Luther's excellent treatise on "Secular Magistrates: How Far They Must be Obeyed," 1523 (X, 395, 38 ff.): "The secular government has laws which extend no further than over body and property and whatever is external on earth. For over the soul God can and will allow no one to rule but Himself alone. Whenever the worldly power, therefore, presumes to legislate for the soul, it interferes with God's government, and only misleads and destroys the soul. This we purpose to make so plain that it cannot but be grasped, in order that our youngers, the princes and bishops, may see what fools

they are when they purpose to compel the people by their laws and commandments to believe thus or so.

"Although they are big fools, they must confess that they have no power over the soul. For it is evident that no man is able to kill or to quicken a soul, to lead it to heaven or to hell. And although they should refuse to believe this, Christ will certainly give sufficiently strong testimony to the truth of our statement, saying: 'Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell,' Matt. 10, 28. Here, methinks, the soul is plainly enough taken out of every human hand and placed under God's hand alone.

"Now tell me, how much wit do you suppose that chap to have who legislates where he has no authority whatsoever? Who would not judge him to be insane who would command the moon to shine when he wants it to shine? What a fine specimen of consistency if the citizens of Leipsic should want to impose laws on us at Wittenberg, or *vice versa*? They would certainly return thanks to such legislators by giving them snuff to clear the head and cure their cold. Notwithstanding, here our emperor and prudent princes are pursuing such a course of action, and permit pope, bishops, and sophists so to lead them, the blind leading the blind, that they command their people to believe, regardless of the Word of God, as they think fit; and yet claim to be Christian rulers; Heaven forbid!

"In addition, one may grasp it also by bearing in mind that every power should and can act only there where it is able to see, know, decide, judge, and bring about a change. For what sort of judge would he be who would blindly judge causes which he neither hears nor sees? Now tell me, how can any man see, know, try, judge, and change men's hearts? For this is exclusively a prerogative of God. . . . For this reason it is vain and impossible to command or to compel one by force to believe thus or so. . . .

"Besides, it is at every one's own peril how he believes, and he must see for himself that he believe aright. For as little as another can go to hell or to heaven for me, so little

also can he believe or disbelieve for me: and as little as he can open or shut heaven or hell for me, so little also can he force me to believe or not to believe. Since, then, it is at the peril of every one's conscience how he believes or disbelieves, and no prejudice is thereby done to the secular power, the latter should also be satisfied and mind its own business, letting people believe thus or so, as they can and like, and urging no one by force. For faith is essentially a free work, to which no one can be forced. Indeed, it is a divine work in the spirit; how, then, should external force be able to produce and extort it? Hence the common saying, which is found in Augustine also: To faith no one can and should be forced.

"Moreover, these blind, wretched people do not see what a vain and impossible task they are undertaking. For however severely they command, and however vehemently they rage, they can at all events make the people do no more than follow them with the mouth and with the hand; the heart they certainly cannot constrain, though they should tear themselves to pieces. For true is the proverb: Thoughts are free. . . .

"You say, But civil authority does not compel them to believe, but restrains only outwardly, lest the people be seduced by false doctrine; how else could heretics be restrained? I reply, This the bishops should do; to them this office and work has been committed, and not to the princes. For heresy can never be repressed by force; that calls for a different management, this being a conflict and controversy unlike that in which the sword is used. The Word of God must contend here; if that prove ineffectual, the thing will assuredly remain unaffected of temporal power, though it bathe the world in blood. Heresy is a spiritual thing which one cannot strike with steel, nor burn with fire, nor drown in water. Only the Word of God is here, however; that is sufficient, as St. Paul says, 2 Cor. 10, 4. 5: 'The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.'

"Besides, there is no greater strengthening of faith and of heresy than when people proceed against it without the Word of God with mere force. For it will be held for certain that such power has no righteous cause, and deals contrary to justice, because it proceeds without the Word of God, and knows of no other resort than main force, as irrational brutes do. . . .

"Behold, then, what fine, prudent youngers these are! They mean to expel heresy, but go about it in such a way as only to strengthen the adversaries, laying themselves open to suspicion and justifying the former. If you wish to expel heresy, you must hit on a way by which, above all things, you pluck it out of the heart, and remove it root and all with right good will; by force you will not achieve this, but only strengthen it. What will it profit you, then, if you strengthen heresy in the heart, and weaken it only outwardly on the tongue, and make people tell lies? The Word of God, however, that enlightens the heart; and thus all heresies and errors pass out of the heart of themselves." (See also: "Of Adoring the Sacrament," 1524, XIX, 1321, 35.)

At the end of 1524, "Luther suddenly abandoned his views on the freedom of conscience," says A. F. Pollard, in "Cambridge Modern History," vol. II, p. 194. And an English Socialist writes: "Before the Peasants' War, when struggling to assert himself, Luther taught that heresy could not be repressed by force, that no fire could burn it, and no water drown it. Yet so soon as Luther saw other sectaries springing up around him, and claiming the same privilege as himself, he declared that as rebels to the State they deserved punishment, even banishment and death. This, then, is Luther's doctrine: The State is the head of religion, and *all* sectaries are rebels to the State." (Karl Pearson, M. A., formerly Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, in "The Ethic of Freethought," London, 1888, p. 232.) This writer evidently permitted himself to be blinded by his love for the Socialists of the sixteenth century, "the peasant robbers and murderers."

In a letter to Lazarus Spengler, of Nuernberg, dated February 4, 1525 (XXIa, 715), Luther says: "In reply to

your question as to how they [Thomas Muenzer and his followers in Nuernberg] should be punished, I, too, hold that they are not guilty of blasphemy, but I regard them just as the Turks and apostate Christians on whom secular magistrates are not to inflict punishment, particularly no corporal punishment. But if they should refuse to recognize and obey the secular magistrate, then everything is forfeited whatever they are and have; for in that case they assuredly meditate revolt and murder, and it is the duty of the secular magistrate to take cognizance of the matter." A few months later the Peasants' War came upon the country with all its horrors.

Sermon preached on the 5th Sunday after Epiphany on Matt. 13, 24—30; published in February, 1525, and republished in 1540 (XI, 504): "This Gospel teaches what attitude we are to maintain toward these heretics. We are not to root them out or destroy them. Christ plainly says here, 'Let both grow together.' We should use nothing but the Word of God here, because in regard to this matter it so happens that he who errs to-day, to-morrow may get into the right way. Who can tell at what time the Word of God will touch his heart? But if he be burned at the stake or deprived of his life in some other way, it is thereby made impossible for him to get into the right way. He is thus cut off from the Word of God and necessarily lost, whereas he might otherwise have been saved perhaps. In that case there comes to pass what the Lord says here in our text, *viz.*, while they gather up the tares, they root up also the wheat with them. That is, now, a most horrible thing in God's sight, and can never be justified. See, therefore, what insane people we have been so long a time, in that we meant to force the Turks to believe with the sword, the heretics with fire, the Jews by slaying, and gather up the tares by our own power, as if we were the people who are able to rule over men's hearts and minds, and as if we could make them godly and righteous, which only the Word of God can do. By killing them, however, we separate the people from the Word, so that it cannot possibly exert its influence on them, and thus make ourselves guilty of a double murder at once, so

far as we are concerned, inasmuch as we inflict temporal death on the body and, at the same time, eternal death on the soul, saying besides that we had done God service, and think we had earned a special reward in heaven. Therefore this passage should fairly frighten the inquisitors and manslayers (if they had no brow of brass), even if they had real heretics before them. But now they burn real saints, and are heretics themselves."

Letter to the city council of Danzig, May 5, 1525 (XXIa, 741): "But in particular, see that you are not taught to bear rule according to the law of Moses, and much less according to the Gospel. . . . The Gospel is a spiritual law, according to which rule cannot be borne, but every one must set it before himself to see whether or no he shall do what it says. And no one can and ought to be forced to accept it, even as no one can and ought to be forced to believe; for it is not the sword, but the Spirit of God that must teach and bear rule here. . . . The Gospel requires willing hearts that are led by the Spirit of God." See also the letter to the Christians in Livonia, June 17, 1525 (X, 259, 6).

"An Admonition to Peace," May, 1525 (XVI, 50, 9): "Secular magistrates must not interpose any prohibition as to what any one wishes to teach or believe, be it Gospel or falsehood; it is enough that they forbid the teaching of revolt and disturbances."

An open letter on the severe treatise against the peasants, 1525 (XIX, 40): "Who has ever heard that a person could be forced to do good or evil? Who is able to coerce a man's will?"

Letter to Spalatin, November 11, 1525 (XXIa, 807 f.): "Our princes do not compel to faith and the Gospel, but suppress external abominations. Since they [the papists] themselves, then, confess that princes have authority in external things, they condemn themselves. For princes must suppress public immoralities, as perjury, manifest blasphemies of God's name, such as these are, thereby compelling to no action, however, whether those who are being restrained believe or not, nor

yet when they revile in secret or not. For we are speaking of public revilings and blasphemies by which they blaspheme our God. This, I say, we must suppress if we can; if we cannot, we are compelled to permit it. Here no one is as yet compelled to faith or the Gospel; no one is compelled to an impious opinion of the heart, which they would do if they could."

At Augsburg, in 1518, the envoy of Cajetan, Urbanus de Serralonga, asked Luther, "What would you do if the pope and his cardinals were in your power?" "Treat them with respect," was Luther's reply. Carlstadt was one of the "other sectaries springing up around" Luther. Let us see whether Luther declared that he "deserved punishment, even banishment and death."

Letter to John Brismann in Koenigsberg, August 16, 1525 (XXIa, 772): "The unhappy fellow [Carlstadt] has been kept at my house in secret and safety [eight weeks]. Now the wide world is too narrow for him: he is everywhere so pursued that he has been compelled to beg his enemy for protection. I have treated the fellow as humanely as I possibly could, and have assisted him; however, he persists in his opinion, although convicted, as is the wont of this sort of spirits. Do you, therefore, beware of him and his doctrine!"

Letter to the Elector John, September 12, 1525 (XXIa, 779): "I write this, because I sincerely pity the poor man, and Your Electoral Grace well knows that mercy is to be shown to the miserable, especially to the innocent" [Carlstadt's family].

Letter to the Elector John, November 22, 1526 (XXIa, 895 f.): "Doctor Carlstadt has importuned me to intercede for him with Your Electoral Grace that he may be permitted to live at Kemberg, because the malice of the peasants makes it impossible for him to stay in the villages. I humbly beseech Your Electoral Grace to grant him this favor, although Your Electoral Grace has already done much for him and incurred much unfavorable comment on his account. He must answer for his soul; to his body and his own we should do good."

Letter to Nic. Gerbel, July 28, 1528 (XXIa, 1181): "Carlstadt, the viper in our bosom, is merely muttering, but does not dare to come out openly" [in favor of Zwingli].

Letter to the Elector John in regard to the abolition of the papal ceremonies in the collegiate church at Altenburg, February 9, 1526 (XXIa, 836): "Therefore you may graciously desire them either to desist altogether, or else to have their doings privately, without scandal to others. . . . If these abominations could or would be kept up without Your Electoral Grace's patronage and support [from the public treasury], you would be wholly without blame, and would have to let it continue. . . . The other reason is this: A secular ruler cannot permit his people to be led into dissension and discord by antagonistic preachers, because of the fear that it would eventually lead to disturbances and riot, but at one and the same place there shall also be the same kind of preaching. With this argument they at Nuernberg silenced their friars and closed the cloisters. . . . Lest they should say, however, that they were being compelled to faith, it should be intimated to them that such is not the intention, but that only their public scandal is forbidden, which they are not able to maintain by themselves, and concerning which they are obliged to confess that it has no warrant in Scripture, and yet mean to maintain the same wantonly to ruin other souls and to harm the country and its inhabitants, also to the disgrace and reproach of God and His Gospel. Let them be satisfied that they are allowed to stay in the country and to enjoy life and property, protection and honor, and that they may worship and serve in private whomsoever they like and as many gods as they like; publicly they shall not thus blaspheme the true God and seduce the people, unless they prove from Scripture that they have a right so to do."

Letter to the Christians at Erfurt, November, 1527 (X, 1524, 1): "God forbid that I should presume to have authority over other preachers, to be their judge or ruler, lest I also establish a papacy; but I will commit them to Christ, who only shall rule over His preachers in Christendom. . . . This,

I fear, is the reason why God is permitting you, despite this great light, to be troubled by that preacher of darkness, Doctor Conrad Klingen, the Franciscan, and does not give your city councilors courage to take action that the discord between the preachers be composed by causing them to hold a discussion and obliging those who cannot prove their views to keep silence, as other cities. Nuernberg and the like, have done. For it certainly is expedient for no city that public agitators and preachers be permitted to create discord among the people. One party should give way, whether it be the Evangelicals or the Papists, as Christ teaches, Matt. 10: 'In whatsoever city they refuse to hear your words, depart out of that city, and shake off the dust of your feet.' From him that refuses to hear us we are easily and soon parted."

"Against the Anabaptists," February, 1528 (XVII, 2188, 3): "Still it is not right, and I am sincerely sorry, that those wretched people [the Anabaptists] are so miserably murdered, burned, and cruelly slain. Everybody should be allowed to believe what he likes. If his belief be wrong, he will receive sufficient punishment in eternal hell-fire. Why, then, do they want to inflict on them temporal tortures also, so long as they merely err in faith, and are not seditious withal or otherwise resist the powers that be? Good God, how easily does it not happen that a person errs and falls into the snares of Satan! They should be resisted with Scripture and God's Word; with fire little will be achieved."

Letter to Wenceslaus Link, July 14, 1528 (X, 1533, 2 f.; cf. XXIa, 1403): "You ask whether it be lawful for the magistrate to kill false prophets? I am tardy to the sentence of death, even where it is abundantly merited. . . . For this reason I will and can in no wise advise nor admit that the magistrate have power to punish false teachers with death: it is enough that they be banished."

On April 19, 1529, the Protestants stated in their "Protest" that "in matters pertaining to God's honor and our souls' salvation every one must stand alone before God, and give an account of himself." "This "Protest," the "Magna Charta of

civil and religious liberty," had the full approval of Luther. (See De Wette, "Letters of Luther," III, 438—441.)

In the preface to his Small Catechism, 1529, Luther writes: "For although we cannot and should not force any one to believe, yet we should train and urge the masses to know what is right and wrong among those with whom they dwell and wish to make their living. For whoever would dwell in a city should know and observe the city laws which he wishes to enjoy, whether he believe or be at heart a hypocrite or knave."

Letter to Thomas Loescher, August 26, 1529 (XXIa, 1349; De Wette I, 326): "As to what you write about those blaspheming despisers [of the Gospel], this is my opinion: Even as no one is to be forced to believe and to accept the Gospel, so it is not to be permitted under the same magistrate that they blaspheme; but having been summoned, they are to be heard and to hear; and if they are not able to give an account, nor want to believe, they should also be bound over to complete silence; and a hotbed of sedition shall not be maintained. For whoever will contradict should do so publicly, and either publicly or privately he should be held in check by the authority of the magistrate." Compare also the letter under the same date to Joseph Levin Metzsch, X, 1686.

To the Elector John, November 18, 1529 (X, 552, 1): "We would prefer to die a hundred deaths to having our conscience reproach us that our Gospel had been the cause of any bloodshed or damage done on our account."

Sermon on 1 John 3, 21, A. D. 1529—1530 (IX, 1591, 68): "But with unbelief civil government has nothing to do."

"An Admonition to Receive the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord," 1530 (X, 15): "If any one wants to deny Christ, and become unchristian and remain an unbeliever, we let him alone, without laying constraint on him, nor do we bother ourselves about him, except that we say to him: 'He that believeth not shall be damned.' He will meet his judge and constrainer without fail; we are excused and have done our duty."

Exposition of the 82d Psalm, 1530 (V, 717, 52 f.): "Here the question arises whether they [the secular rulers] should also repress and punish heresies, since no one should and can be forced to believe. Here we must answer: First, some heretics are seditious, who publicly teach that no magistrate should be tolerated; likewise, that no Christian may hold a magisterial office; also, that one should possess no property, but desert wife and children, forsake house and home, or hold and have all things in common. Such are straightly and without any doubt to be punished by the magistrate, inasmuch as they openly oppose the civil laws and the powers that be, Rom. 13. For they are not simply heretics only, but as seditious they attack the powers that be, and their government and order. . . .

"Secondly, if any would teach contrary to a known article of faith which is clearly established in Scripture and received the world over by all Christendom, such as the children are taught in the Creed; *e. g.*, if any one would teach that Christ is not God, but a mere man, and the same as any other prophet, as the Turks and the Anabaptists hold: such should not be tolerated either, but punished the same as public profaners, for they, too, are not simply heretics only, but public blasphemers. Now it is clearly the duty of the magistrate to punish public blasphemers, as those are punished who in other respects curse, swear, reproach, revile, rail, slander, defame, etc. For such teachers dishonor the name of God by their blasphemy, and deprive their neighbor of his honor before men. Likewise the magistrate should also punish, or at least not tolerate, those who teach that Christ had not died for our sins, but that every one must render satisfaction for them himself. For that is also public blasphemy against the Gospel and a commonly received article of faith confessed by us in the Creed, where we say: 'I believe the forgiveness of sins,' and, 'I believe in Jesus Christ, who died, rose again,' etc.; likewise, whoever teaches that there is no resurrection of the dead, and no life everlasting nor hell, and the like; as the Sadducees and Epicureans taught, who are multiplying at the present time also among the great wiseacres. For by such action no one is forced to believe, for

he can still very well believe what he pleases. Only his teaching and blaspheming is forbidden, by which he means to take from God and the Christians their doctrine and Word, and wants to do this to their injury while enjoying their protection and sharing all their secular privileges. Let him remove to a place where there are no Christians, and do it there.

"In the third place, if it happens that in a parish, city, or dominion the Papists and Lutherans (as they are called) get to brawling and preach against each other with regard to some points of doctrine, both sides claiming to have the Scriptures on their side, I should still be unwilling to suffer such dissension, and my Lutherans also should willingly retire and keep silence if they noticed that people were unwilling to hear them, as Christ teaches Matt. 10, and wait to have themselves constrained to preach, as I do. For I quit without much ado if they are unwilling to hear me, and all my preaching and writing I had to do by constraint. But if neither party is willing to yield and keep silence, or perhaps cannot do so for reasons of office, then the magistrate should take action and hear the matter, and whichever side does not prove its point from Scripture should be bound over to silence. For it is not expedient that antagonistic preaching be permitted to prevail among the people of a parish, because it results in divisions, disturbances, hatred and envy, in other secular matters also.

"By none of these things is any one forced to believe, but the peace of the congregation is secured against those headstrong chaps." ⁴⁾

Exposition of the 118th Psalm, June 13—26, 1530 (V, 1189, 25. 75): "The true Christian Church preaches the Word

4) As the purpose of this contribution is not to vindicate, but to present, Luther's views on freedom of conscience, we cannot enter into a detailed discussion of the foregoing quotation. We can merely suggest, first, that the reader study the opinions of eminent American jurists on the subject of blasphemy, and, secondly, that he bear in mind that Luther, who was a most practical man, wrote in Germany, not in the United States, in the sixteenth century, not in the twentieth. Both, place and time,—it was a time of tremendous changes and peculiar conditions,—necessitated the policy advocated by him.

of God, and forces no one to receive it; the person that refuses to believe it she lets alone, and withdraws herself from him, as Christ teaches Matt. 10 and 18, and as St. Paul does throughout the book of Acts, consigning them to God's judgment.

"We kill none on account of their doctrine, nor do we spoil any of their worldly goods, but let every one believe what he pleases; we do not lay constraint on them, we do not urge them by violence; we let the powers that be punish revolt, disturbances, and dissension, nor is it our purpose or plan to injure any one: but rather do we prevent all these things wherever and by whatever means we can possibly do so; we inculcate and preserve peace most zealously, and, on the other hand, suffer murder, bloodshed, poverty, and persecution most horribly, all these things being signs of a true spirit."

Comment on Matt. 7, 15, November 9, 1530; published in 1532 (VII, 625, 94): "Though dealing with a high hand, they can but take my life and goods; but my heart and faith they cannot take away from me by force."

"An Epistle of Warning to the People in Frankfurt-on-the-Main," A. D. 1533 (XVII, 2017, 22): "We force no one to confession, as all our writings attest; whoever does not want it, let him forbear; even as we do not care if any one will not have our Catechism and doctrine. In this no one constrains another. For, thank God, we are sufficiently taught that Christ, our Lord, will have no haughty, headstrong chap in His kingdom. Why, then, should we bring such haughty spirits into His kingdom by force?"

Letter to Lorenz Castner and his associates in Freiberg, February 11, 1536 (XX, 1758): "The magistrates would do well to attend to the matter, and bind this spirit over to silence. For he would like to plunge you at Freiberg into disaster."

Letter to King Christian of Denmark, December 2, 1536 (XXIb, 2127): "I am pleased that you have extirpated the bishops (who can not cease from persecuting God's Word and troubling the secular government)."

Letter to Melancthon, April 8, 1540 (XXIb, 2445): "For although we poor sinners walk in the sinful flesh, still we are

pure from blood, yea, we hate those bloody men and the god of blood who possesses and drives them."

Against Hans Wurst, A. D. 1541 (XVII, 1326, 30): "No one can deny that we do not shed blood, murder, and hang people, and take revenge, as indeed we might have done and still might do."

Sermon on the Gospel for the 23d Sunday after Trinity, Matt. 22, 15—22; published in 1544 (XIIIa, 968, 16 ff.): "Caesar [the government] should not disturb in any way the government of God, and not prevent the people from rendering unto God the things which they should render to God. . . .

"If the secular rulers, however, should undertake to do this, the subjects should not obey them, but rather suffer whatever sufferings this may entail. . . .

"God will place body and goods, house and home under the power of Caesar, that only the heart be reserved to Himself and He may rule in the heart by His Word and Spirit." (Comp. XIIIa, 721, 21. 22.)

In his very last sermon, preached at Eisleben, February 15, 1546, three days before his death, the great champion of private judgment and liberty of conscience declared once more (XII, 1260, 14): "I allow that the emperor, king, pope, cardinal, princes, and lords are prudent and wise; but I will believe on my Lord Christ alone: He is my Master and Lord whom God has directed me to hear and to learn of Him what is true, divine wisdom. Whereat the pope and his partisans cry out: Nay, nay! you ought not do so; you ought to obey the rulers, and do what we bid you. True, say I, this I should do, but you must first agree with the Lord who here says: 'All things are delivered unto me of my Father,' etc. Therefore, dear pope, emperor, king, lord, and prince, do not come at me thus: I will gladly hearken to you in the worldly government, but your claim to sit in Christendom as lord, and to have authority to decide what I should believe and do, this claim I deny; for you wish to be prudent and wise in a matter where you are a fool, and where nothing has been revealed to you. For here is the Lord whom alone we should hear in these matters, as He also

says in this passage: 'Neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him.'...

"This, and much more, might be said on this Gospel, but I am too feeble; let this suffice. God give us grace that we receive His precious Word with thanksgiving, and increase and grow in the knowledge and faith of His Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, and continue steadfast in the confession of His holy Word unto the end. Amen."

St. Louis, Mo.

C. F. DREWES.

BOOK REVIEW.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF MARTIN LUTHER, by *Preserved Smith*, Ph. D. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston. 1911.
\$3.50 net. XVI and 490 pages.

This biography of Luther is introduced by the publishers as "the most humanly interesting, as well as the latest and most authoritative." This statement is borne out by every chapter and page of Dr. Smith's most fascinating account of the Reformer's eventful life. First, his delineation of Luther is "most humanly interesting." He studies the man Luther, and his keen eye has observed a wealth of detail that exhibits the truly human, the intensely human, manner and fashion of Luther's actions. Luther is to the author always a great man, and his work epochal. To the last he keeps up his admiration for him: when the dead Luther is lowered into the tomb in the Castle Church at Wittenberg, the author still remembers that this is the place whence the words went forth that shook the world. But the actions of this man were just such as one would expect of such a man. What Dr. Smith says of Brother Augustine at the monastery of the Augustinian Hermits at Erfurt applies to Luther at every other stage of his life. He says: "Of course Luther's development was not completed at once. Even after the master-key had been found, the long struggle continued, and other factors entered in to modify and enrich his character. He entered the monastery to save his soul, and the struggle for peace took twelve long years before the monk was ripe for the great deeds he was called on to perform. No one can get even an idea of what the struggle cost him, save by reading after him the folios and quartos he perused, and trying to follow him in all that tangled labyrinth. And yet his development was perfectly normal and even. That his health suffered somewhat from asceticism

is undoubtedly true, but there were no morbid symptoms in his conversion. Comparing it to that of other famous Christians, there were no visions such as Loyola saw, and no moral breakdown such as that of Augustine. In those years of hardship, meditation, study, and thought he laid the foundation of that adamant character which stood unshaken amidst a tempest that rocked Europe to its base." This "adamantine character" in its "normal development" is throughout the subject of Dr. Smith's exhaustive study. The plan which he has adopted to make men see the truly human Luther is the happiest imaginable. He makes Luther tell his own life. In no extant biography of Luther—Michelet not excepted—is the vast correspondence of Luther used so extensively, and with such excellent critical acumen, as in this work of Dr. Smith. There is nothing labored and intricate in this Life of Luther. We have no doubt that it will become the favorite biography for the intelligent and cultured Christian layman. Dr. Smith, indeed, knows Luther also as an intensely religious man, a man of prayer, and faith, and full of works of righteousness. He knows him also as a great theologian. But this last feature is the least prominent in his account, and his estimate of Luther in this respect is subject to discount. For instance, Luther's attitude in the controversy with Erasmus has not been understood, especially his remarks on the sovereignty of the divine will in its dealings with men. The tendency of Luther's remarks on the canon of Scripture has been overdrawn, possibly under the unconscious influence of Twentieth Century Biblical criticism. Nor is the lasting worth of Luther's activity—what Lutherans call the evermore enduring element—properly appreciated. Nevertheless, Dr. Smith is so fair and unbiased in his general narrative and frequently defends Luther so ably against calumnies, that it is a continuous pleasure to follow him in his account. While his book will not supersede the works of Koestlin or Kolde, it possesses a merit distinctly its own, which will insure it an abiding place alongside of the books of these German scholars.—As to the other feature of Dr. Smith's work, which the publishers mention, there is no doubt that Dr. Smith's Life of Luther is "the latest and most authoritative." The bibliography appended at the end of the book covers 38 pages, and reveals the author's wide reading. Besides this he has searched the Berlin Royal Library, the Bodleian Library at Oxford, the British Museum, and other storehouses for valuable documentary evidence, and has enjoyed the immense privilege of conferring personally with leading scholars at home and abroad who are regarded as authorities on the history of Luther and his work.—In an Epilogue the author relates "The Last Years and Death of Luther's Wife."